BT
301
.R383
G4
1894

ESSAYS.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
AUG 14 1948
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ESSAYS

BY
EMILY OLIVER GIBBES

NEW YORK
CHARLES T. DILLINGHAM & CO.
766 BROADWAY
1894

COPYRIGHT, 1894,
BY
EMILY OLIVER GIBBES.

CONTENTS.

Page

AN ESSAY ON ERNEST RENAN'S "LIFE OF JESUS." 9

AN ESSAY ON DE TUNZELMANN'S "ELECTRICITY IN MODERN LIFE." . . . 79

AN ESSAY ON MIVART'S "CHRISTIANITY AND ROMAN PAGANISM." 95

AN ESSAY ON STRAUSS'S "LIFE OF JESUS." 109

AN ESSAY

ON ERNEST RENAN'S LIFE OF JESUS,

FROM THE

FRENCH TWENTY-SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND AUGMENTED, OF 1893.

[9]

AN ESSAY

ON ERNEST RENAN'S LIFE OF JESUS.

In reading Renan's book it has seemed to us that he was under two great influences when he wrote it—one his early Roman Catholic Church training, and the other Strauss' book on the life of Jesus. Both of these influences are at great extremes, and totally opposite to each other. The first believes all that has been added on to the Christian belief, until Jesus is almost forgotten; and the other seems anxious to kill the Christian religion completely.

Nevertheless, Renan's book must do great good for the Christian religion, pure and simple, as Jesus gave it to us. This good will be done among those men who, so far, are unwilling to believe in the life of Jesus. In reading

Renan's book we have made some marginal notes, which we here collect together, giving the numbers of the pages of his book on which we made the notes.

In his Preface, *page* 6, he says he does not believe in the supernatural for the same reason that he does not believe in Centaurs and Hippogriffes, and his reason for not doing so is, that these have never been seen. If we only believed what *we saw*, and denied the existence of what we did *not see*, what a very poor life ours would be! As for the *Centaurs*, and such beings as half animal, half man, they may have existed when animal was turning into mankind; we do not believe that any idea of Centaurs could come spontaneously to the mind of man. Renan also says here: "The Gospels are legends; they may contain history; but certainly all in them is not history." Here we would ask if there is any history written which is wholly true, above all, history of eighteen hundred and ninety-three years ago. We believe there is nothing supernatural, as all things are possible to God and we know very little of His laws.

Page 9. "We cannot believe in the supernatural, because we cannot believe in a thing of which there is no experimental trace to be found in the world." This is not good reasoning, as science has proved, for science, year by year, is experimentally proving things to be true, which were not even dreamed of years ago. "History is essentially disinterested." But is it so? History is written by fallible man, and he is fenced in by many things, such as school training, the thoughts of his early friends, his own personal views of the history he is writing, his likes and dislikes, which, if he wishes it or not, in some way bias what he is writing. "The orthodox theologian may be compared to a bird in a cage; he is forbidden any voluntary movement." This is very true; at the same time it is a protection in some way to the faith, when the faith is to be taught by a set of persons who do so only as a personal business, gain of money, or any other gain,—it is dogmatic and the spiritual world will be far advanced over the carnal when dogma can be put on one side.

Page 10. Here Renan says that we will not

arrive at a criticism of the Christian religion, until criticism comes from a mind which knows no theology, and which neither thinks of defending nor of overturning the dogmas. This is what we think, and God grant that to our mind, which is free from dogmas, and for which we care not at all, there may come the truth of Jesus. Renan thinks that these questions should not be agitated with any prejudice except that which constitutes the essence of reason. We think that *reason* in mankind is not and cannot be infallible. "The fourth Gospel is mostly written by St. John, though it may have been altered by John's disciples. The discourses are often free compositions, expressing only the way the author understood the Spirit of Jesus." We think, of course, this must have been so, we have always understood, it to be so; but as the Gospel, spoken of here, must have been written at first by some one near Jesus all the time, we accept the author's view of the Spirit of Jesus.

Page 11. "The fourth Gospel is not at all written by St. John. It is a work of imagination or an allegory, where the author does not mean

to write about the life of Jesus, but about the idea which he has of Jesus." We think, if this was so, that his idea of Jesus was inspired.

Page 17. Renan says: "The text of the Gospels is not history, it does not give certainty, but it gives something. We must not follow the text blindly, nor must we deprive ourselves unjustly of its testimony; we must try to find out what it hides, without ever being absolutely sure that we have found it." In this we fully agree, for all is spiritual, and it is only as our inward soul *understands* the life of Jesus that it appears to us as true; so we read it in the Gospels, and so we judge ourselves.

We think the reason that the Jews or the Romans put Jesus to death was because the Jews could not understand that the Kingdom of Jesus was a spiritual one and not an earthly one. Some make out that Jesus was only man, as they are able in their hearts to understand him; they are not *able* in their minds to see that though Jesus was wholly a man in his human body, yet he was more than man by the Spirit of God which was in him.

Page 19. "It is best to keep close to the written account and keep clear of impossibilities." We would ask here: what would our great-great-grandfathers have thought in their day had they been told of the things done in our day by science? We believe it not only possible, but true, that Jesus could appear to Paul; and the only way to receive spiritual knowledge is to have a vivid and preoccupied imagination.

Page 22. We must here take up the defense of women and children. It was Jesus that told us that children are near the Kingdom of Heaven, and by his life we see that women were able best to understand that life.

Page 25. We here find that Renan does not fully understand the human nature of Jesus and his Divine nature; both are so plain to us when we read the Gospels.

Page 27. We are sorry to see that the foolish so-called miracles of the Roman Church are mentioned at all with the signs which Jesus gave as to his knowledge and power of the great laws of nature.

Page 28. "Science is pure, for science has nothing of practice; she does not touch men; to spread knowledge and gain disciples does not concern her; her duty is to prove, not to persuade nor convert." We see science in another light; we think she has much to do with man, for she teaches him whence he came, to what he goes in nature, and it is only by practice that she can prove anything as true—she cannot live without disciples to spread her knowledge and when she *proves*, she persuades and converts.

Page 30. We think that when Renan says that the religions fall one by one, he must mean that dogmas fall one by one; for dogmas to us are a very different thing from our belief in God, and in His direct words to us through Jesus Christ.

INTRODUCTION.

Page 49. We are glad to see here that the Gospel of Luke cannot be doubted to have been written by him. As St. Luke was a physician,

he could testify to the truth of the Gospel account of the birth of Christ.

Page 55. "As they thought the end of the world near, no one cared to write books for the future." What reason had they to think this? Jesus had told them that no one but God knew when the world would end.

Page 62. Renan doubts if John, the simple fisherman, could have written the Gospel bearing John's name, and yet it was after the apostles had received the gift of the Holy Ghost that they spoke in tongues which, before, were unknown to them.

Page 70. We do not think that it is possible that so soon after the death of Jesus the apostles could fall into mysteries which were of no use. There is a spiritual mystery in all the words of Jesus, and therefore in the written words of the Gospels, which it is our duty to find out.

Page 75. Renan tells us here that many a book, once thought to be heretical, has forced its way into the church and become a book of faith; this being so how vigilant those in the church

should be, for Satan, whose world we are on, will, to the end, fight the Kingdom of God, which is in our souls.

Page 89. This comparison between the Gospels and Napoleon's soldiers' writing a history of Napoleon's life, we think is in very bad taste, to say the least of it. The disciples of Jesus were undoubtedly helped in their account of Jesus' life by the Spirit within them, that is in writing it they were able to see some of the spiritual meaning.

Page 103. How can Renan speak in the same breath of the religions of Jesus and Mahomet? The first lived by giving us the true life; the second lived by taking life.

Page 104. "God has revealed himself before Jesus, God will reveal himself after him." We think not, for the God of the Jews was according to their showing *cruel*, the God in Christ was *love*.

Page 105. Renan ends his introduction by saying that the manifestations of God, hid in the human conscience, are all the same, but we think this can only be so since Christ lived among us.

We knew not God in that way until we knew Jesus; we must not forget that Jesus showed us God as we never saw him before, the Jewish history proves that this is so, but, as Renan says, Jesus belongs to every one in whom is a human heart.

THE CHAPTERS ON THE LIFE OF JESUS.

Page 2. "As soon as man found himself different from mere animal, he became religious, that is, he saw in nature something beyond the reality, and for himself something beyond death." This was when mankind was evolved from animal, at the time when the Bible tells us that man began to call upon Go

Page 15. "The unknown author of the book of Daniel, in any case, had a decisive influence on the religious events which were going to transform the world." All of which must refer to the time of Jesus' life on this earth.

Page 21. We do not see anything difficult in understanding that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, and not in Nazareth, for when we come to

the question of paying a tax, it removes all doubt.

Page 23. And yet the generation is given in Matthew and Luke.

Page 30. This idea of a church built at Nazareth is a Roman Catholic Church idea, for the building would soon become the idol, and Christ would be forgotten; for it was Christ who told us that the Kingdom of Heaven is within us, and not at a spot of land called Nazareth or at Jerusalem.

Page 32. "It is, however, doubtful that Jesus understood the Hebrew writings in their original language." We read that Jesus, as a child, was able to ask questions and give answers to the scribes in the temple; but, if what Renan says were so, then it is a greater proof that Jesus, by the Spirit within him, knew all things.

Page 36. Here Renan tells us that in those days no one studied Greek, or very few did so; that Greek studies, which we understand to mean Greek writings, were hardly good enough to be worn even by the women on their garments. Now we think that if the women had on

their garments Greek writings they must have tried to understand the writings, and perhaps they gained some knowledge of the prophesies of Christ that way.

Page 42. Jesus could not have been in all things like other children, for he knew exactly what kings, and those in earthly power, were inwardly.

Page 43. We do not agree here with Renan, for, as we in the flesh are the children of the devil, the maladies of the flesh are of the devil. How could Jesus not believe in the devil, when he had come to this earth to take the body of flesh, and in it to fight the devil, the father of the body of flesh, and to dwell among the children of the devil? He came for the sake of the spark from Heaven which lived still in these bodies of flesh and blood, to show them the way to overcome the flesh and enter Heaven again through the only door open to them—that door is Jesus Christ.

Page 44. Renan here thinks that Jesus had a strong faith in the connexions between mankind and God, and that the belief of Jesus in the power of man was exaggerated. We think that

time has proved that this is not as Renan thinks, for man has the power which Jesus said he would have. Science, which is of God, proves that this is so. A man of science must have faith in his work, he must have an inward conviction that what he attempts to do can be done, otherwise he would not persevere until he succeeds. The physician and the chemist are not yet half way on the road of knowledge. Jesus knew all knowledge. Jesus was not as other children, and when he attained the age to begin his vocation, it was right to break away from earthly relations, who did all they could to prevent him from following his vocation. Where would we be, had Jesus cared more for the relations of the body than the relations of his soul? And how could Jesus think more of the body of flesh and blood, which he came to dwell within for our sakes, and which was also animal, the *same as our body*, when he, Jesus, knew whence his Spirit was? He was Spirit from Heaven. Are we to think more of the clothes which cover our bodies, than of our bodies themselves?

Page 48. Renan tells us that Jesus was not a theologian, if this word means knowledge of God. We think we only know God by what Jesus has told us; but we agree that Jesus had no dogmas in system, that he had a fixed personal resolution, which, being stronger than any other created wish, still guides human destiny.

Page 55. Here Renan speaks of a noble *woman*, the mother of the Maccabees. He does not see the women of the Bible in the light in which we see them.

Page 58. Jesus did not attach any importance to the politics of his time, and Renan thinks that Jesus may have been misinformed about them. We think Jesus knew all about what was passing, for in his teachings he shows that this was so. He certainly took no interest in worldly things.

Page 64. In Galilee they despised this life, but before this the Jews and others thought the greatest blessing was a long life on this earth.

Page 75. Jesus was a carpenter by trade. Renan says this was not a humbling position. We say no, truly, for Jesus has told us that God worked, therefore he *worked;* this he said

in reference to his work for our souls, but his example in *working* we should follow.

Page 75. Renan here makes the mistake of not understanding that passion is not the Bible love which was in Jesus. Jesus came to be with those who sin, so as to prove that they can be saved.

Page 77. "Jesus had a high idea of the Divinity, which he did not get from the Jewish religion." Jesus had been with God before he came to us, so his idea of God was true, and therefore high.

Page 78. Renan tells us that Jesus does not say that he is God—not for a moment even; he believes himself in communication with God, and that he is God's son; and the highest conception of God, among human beings, was Jesus' conception of God. We think that here Renan shows that he felt or understood the *double nature* of Jesus.

Page 84. Refers to the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, 2nd verse,—supposed to foretell of Jesus. We think this means that Jesus was without the

earthly beauty of an earthly kingdom, and not the person of Jesus, for that must have been perfect.

Page 90. "A pure religion, without priests, and without outward practice, resting all on the sentiments of the heart, and on the imitation of God." How are we to know *what* God is so as to imitate him, but by the life and words of Jesus? Are we to imitate the God of the old Jewish nation? That would be a very different thing from the God which Jesus made us know.

Page 94. "No one was less the priest than Jesus. No one was more the enemy of forms, which smother religion, under the pretence of defending it, than Jesus. Into this world has come, through Jesus, a totally new idea of religion, founded on the purity of the heart and kindness to all. This idea of Jesus is so high that the Christian church has not been able to follow it, though given by its Master, and even in these days only a few souls could understand it." After reading these words we have thought, as Renan has told us that Jesus was a Jew,

born in the Jewish country, with all the surroundings of the Jewish nation, beliefs, traditions, customs and teachings of the scribes, and the Jew ish idea of God, that it is a very surprising fact that this high, pure and God-like idea of the true religion should come to one whose life, so far, was no different from those among whom Jesus lived. We think these words alone of Renan's prove that Jesus was more than a human man; and that Jesus' second nature—or rather, first nature —was Divine, and such must have been Renan's thought of Jesus when he wrote these words. Why, then, as he continues the chapter, does Renan fall back to think of Jesus as only a man—human, like himself? and then again, as he reasons, he realizes that Jesus was more than man,—"for Jesus was strong and powerful in words and actions for what is good, and with the price of his blood he made good triumph, and in that respect he has no equal; his glory remains whole and will always be renewed."

Page 101. To think out any high thought or work, one must be alone. John the Baptist and

Jesus also were alone in the desert before they commenced their work.

Page 105. "The belief in resurrections." If mankind thought that resurrections were possible, *the possible* is far beyond what mankind is *able to think.*

Page 111. "Jesus showed that he thought John the Baptist superior to himself." We do not see this in the Bible, for it was Jesus who said that John was the greatest of prophets, but that he who was least in the Kingdom of Heaven was greater than John.

Page 114. Renan thinks that Herodias was married to her uncle against her will; we think her actions show that this was not so.

Page 119. We agree with this, that the Christian religion charmed the highest souls by being free from all outward form.

Page 120. "In this world, such as it is, it is evil which reigns. Satan is the king of this world, and all obey him." Here we agree, as we have tried to show before this in our essay on the "Origin of Sin."

Page 132. Renan says that the first thought of

Jesus—a thought so deep that probably it had no origin, but came from the very roots of his being—was that he was the son of God, intimate with the Father, and the executor of the Father's will; all earthly things were only used by Jesus as instruments to advance the Kingdom of God. A new sky and a new earth will be created, peopled with angels of God. We understand this new earth to have a spiritual meaning; the abode of the souls of the children of God, equal then to the angels of God.

Page 123. Jesus never tried to overthrow the government in any way—he submitted to the powers established. He despised the earth and all in it, so gaining the liberty of souls.

Page 125. It was truly the kingdom of souls which Jesus founded. Yes, this is so, but we are sorry to see that Renan speaks of the history of this world; we think that history has nothing to do with it, for this world is Satan's, and his children's flesh and blood bodies; the souls are God's children.

Page 126. "What was liberty for Jesus was the liberty of Truth, and when he gave us these

words: 'Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's,' he created something altogether different from politics, he created a refuge for souls in the midst of an empire of brutal force." How good this is, but when we come to these words: "Christianity has compensated for the wrong it has done to civil virtues," we think this a strange idea, for are the "vertus civiles" of these days different from those days, and are they virtues at all, even now, though much changed by the Christian religion?

Page 127. "Jesus did not stop the current of the affairs of the earth of his day, but he declared that politics were insignificant, and that country is not all, but man is first and above the citizen." We say, not man, but man's soul; the soul is not the body of flesh and blood, the soul does not live for this earth, or by the bread of this earth. But in this sentiment we agree with Renan; this world, and all in it, is not worth the life of our soul, and the longer we live the more we see that the world is Satan's—there is so much that is disgusting and lowering in it; it is so ani-

mal, even lower than the animals; we are prisoners here,—prisoners of Satan.

Page 129. "Do not believe that with simple ideas of happiness or with individual morality we can shake the world; the idea of Jesus was much deeper; it was the most revolutionary idea that ever came into the human mind." We would say that in Jesus the thought was not all human, it was the Spirit of God. Renan's thoughts of Jesus are hampered by his Roman Catholic early training, and, trying to throw this off, he sees Jesus only as a human man; at times he is forced, by his study of Jesus, to confess that Jesus was something more than a mere man, though a great man.

Page 131. "Jesus announced a great change, unequalled in human things, and in doing so he proclaimed the principles on which society has rested for eighteen hundred years." We think the change did commence, but that it has not yet reached its end; it is slowly going on; it has taken eighteen hundred and ninety-three years to effect some of it. The mistake is that we thought that it would come in our day, and

those before us thought that it would come in theirs.

Page 132. Here Renan thinks that Jesus wished to put an end to riches and power. We do not think so, for Jesus would only wish this when they were used for evil. When he was on this earth he did good to the rich as well as to the poor. "Those who are to found the Kingdom of Heaven will not be the rich, nor the doctors, nor the priests; they will be the women, and the humble ones." Renan seems, in a way, to agree with us, as we think the *women* were better able than the men to understand the teachings of Jesus.

Page 133. Where does Renan find this? Before this he has found that Jesus cared not for "officials" one way or the other.

Page 137. "Jesus cared most to be called the Son of Man." If so, we think it was because Jesus took man's human body, consented to be man, so as to save the race of mankind, and that we might understand that being man, he understood mankind.

Page 144. "The authority of the young

Master grew day by day ; the more they believed in him, the more he believed in himself." We would remark here that Jesus knew, long before they believed in him, who he was ; he knew this when he was but twelve years old, when he said he must do his Father's business, meaning God's.

Page 147. Speaking of the difficulty of finding the exact spot of the places mentioned in the Gospels, Renan says, "It seems as if a deep design hid them, and that the places will never be found where humanity would wish to kiss the print of the feet of Jesus." Without knowing it, he gives us the reason that they are not to be found. It is because mankind so readily fall into idolatry that they would kiss the ground and worship such a thing, and forget that Jesus has told them to worship God alone. If they love Jesus and would show him their love, it is not to be done by kissing the ground around Jerusalem ; it is by seeing that Jesus is in the souls of their fellow-beings, and by doing good to these, that they let Jesus see that they love him.

Page 157. Here the women are mentioned,

Salome and others, who so readily understand and accept Jesus as the Son of God, and listen to all his teachings. These women were not thought to be unsexed because they followed with the men even to the death of Jesus. Renan does not see here what we see, that Jesus knew that women could understand his teachings, and were, in his sight, equal to men.

Page 158. We do not think that the seven demons which Jesus cast out of Mary of Magdala, were the nervous diseases that Renan thinks they were. They were evils of character, heart and mind; no doubt some, if not all, were inherited, and against them this Mary must have struggled to rid herself. We doubt if Jesus would have helped her in this, had he not known that it was her earnest wish to be rid of these evils, and not her wish to be governed by them. It is this Mary who gives to the world the belief in the resurrection, for she was the first one to whom Jesus appeared after his death.

Page 160. "At this time we do not see the mother of Jesus near him; the family of Jesus

was not much with him, and it was only after his death that his mother obtained a great reputation." We think, however, that his mother was the first to believe in Jesus. She pondered in her heart over the things connected with his birth, and she believed that he was able to turn the water into wine at the marriage feast.

Page 161. Here we have a comparison which might have been left out. How can Renan descend from his many high thoughts of Jesus, and speak in the same breath of Mahomet? In reading this book it seems to us that Renan descends from these high and noble thoughts of Jesus, for some hidden reason, as if he feared that his convictions were leading him to prove too strongly the Divine in Jesus, and the Divine in Jesus, not being human history, he, Renan, makes these *descents* in thought, all through his book, so as to keep *within history.*

Page 169. Renan here tells us what he thinks was the cause of the success of Jesus in winning souls—"one penetrating look, one word falling on a pure conscience." We think this is proof by itself of the Divine in Jesus, for in both he

spoke directly to the soul or conscience of the soul. We are sorry to see Renan bring in Jeanne D'Arc here, for it was not affectation on the part of Jesus to bring to a person's mind a past circumstance in that person's life. Renan here proves that Jesus was superior to everything around him, that Jesus himself believed that the Spirit of God revealed these things to him, and that all believed that Jesus lived in a sphere inaccessible to others. We say that as those around Jesus felt that this was so, we of these days feel within us that his life is also inaccessible to plain humanity, but can be followed by us in our souls.

Page 171. Renan speaks of the great ignorance of those who followed Jesus—their ignorance was not ignorance of spiritual things—he thinks it strange that they believed in spirits. To believe in these things now, we think, is not a proof of ignorance, but just the reverse; for in these days it is thought to be very intelligent. The spirits of the departed no doubt live, but Jesus has told us that did they appear and speak to us it would do us no good, for if we will not believe

Moses and the Prophets, we would not believe the spirits of the departed.

Page 174. Renan here tells us that Jesus, spoke in parables, that he did not get this from the Jewish system, but that it was Jesus' own idea.

Page 178. We do not agree here; for we can enjoy seeing these things—the sunshine, flowers, grass, shade, trees, fine views, mountains—without owning them, and we think that others can do the same.

Page 180. Here we think Renan has failed to see the *spiritual* meaning in the words of Jesus, for the Kingdom of God cannot be bought, as Renan says, with earthly money. All this has a deeper meaning. It means that the man who discovers the true life of his soul, places everything else in connection with the body, as being beneath the value of the life of his soul, and will sacrifice all earthly things which in any way prevent the growing life of his soul.

Page 182. We do not agree with Renan here, for we have some in the Gospels who were rich yet good. We understand this to mean that being rich we may be indifferent to the suffer-

ings of others, thinking only of ourselves, and it also means unbelief in God, for the parable ends by saying that if we will not believe in what Moses and the Prophets have told us, we would not believe if one rose from the dead to tell us of God. Riches can only be gained honestly by someone working for them; and Jesus has showed us that work is honorable; it is not riches themselves but the use we put them to, in which is the good or the evil.

Page 183. "The parable of the rich entering into the Kingdom of Heaven and the camel passing through the eye of a needle." We think this means that because they are so well off they think not of God; also they think that all things will go well with them.

Page 186. "That the poor alone are saved." In all this Renan has lost the spiritual meaning—for one can be poor in this world's riches, and also be desperately wicked in heart; it means poor or humble in spirit.

Page 191. François d'Assise did not understand Jesus. We think so for the reason that Jesus never meant us to be idle and expect

others to feed and clothe us, for Jesus set us the example of work, and those who work do not become beggars. Jesus told us that God worked and that he, Jesus, worked; therefore here we do not agree with Renan, and we think that the true moralist should condemn this, for it is not the teaching of Jesus. Man shall not live by bread alone means that man's true life is his soul, and though the body must live its short life by bread, the soul does not live by the earthly bread.

Page 195. "The turning of the water into wine at the wedding." Renan does not see the spiritual in this at all. We think that the carnal marriage was raised to a higher plane, permitted and blessed by the presence of Jesus; a new life was instilled into the human frame, making it more able to follow the teachings of the Spirit.

Page 198. Here Renan also thinks as we do, that women understood Jesus better than men.

Page 199. "We must become as children to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." We understand this to be a child's faith, accepting what his father tells him, doubting nothing.

Renan also tells us here that the word Paradise is Persian, and means a lovely garden. In our "Origin of Sin" we wrote that we think the name, Garden of Eden, was given by those who wrote Genesis as the only way they could think of Heaven, that there never was such a garden on this earth, and that the word Eden means Heaven.

Page 218. Renan here names Nazareth as the birthplace of Jesus, making the same mistake that those of the days of Jesus also made. We see nothing hard to believe in the fact that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, even if there was nothing strange in the manner of his birth, for taxation is a very sure and positive thing.

Page 243. "The Samaritan woman, or the woman of Sichem." We think that Jesus knew that this woman was capable of understanding the truths he told her. In a note here Renan says: "We cannot insist on the historic truth of this conversation, because either Jesus or the woman alone could repeat the words." We do not agree with this, because we are told that the woman went at once to the village and said to the

men to come and see one who had told her these things, and that the people of the village said they believed in Jesus, not so much because of what she had told them, as because they were convinced themselves by Jesus. That God is a Spirit and we must worship him in Spirit, does not, in our mind, change the fact that Jesus will judge the men of this earth. Having lived in the flesh and blood body, having come to this earth to teach, suffer and die to save mankind, and to show us God's will, he is well fitted to judge us at the last. God's judgment alone, without the intercession of Jesus, could be only condemnation if we are the descendants of animals, the descendants through long evolution, of Satan, or the evil one, who was banished from Heaven.

Page 246. We understand this to be the Kingdom of Heaven, God's message to our souls, perhaps *his nearness to our souls* which came to us by Jesus—the one and only opening for our souls to return to God whence they came. This, however, could not be accomplished without violence, for the Father of our flesh and blood bodies, which Fatherhood dwells in our flesh, would

make resistance even to violence, and that violence will continue so long as many human beings or mankind prefer the fatherhood in the flesh to the Fatherhood of the souls. There may be a personal devil, but who can doubt that the flesh is not itself of the devil? This flesh will fight the Kingdom of God, which is in our souls, as long as the world lasts. It was this that put Jesus to death.

Page 250. We do not agree here, for Jesus said that the Scriptures testified of him, therefore the prophecies must also do so. Jesus undoubtedly had a double nature; we know it can be said that so have we—the human nature of the body and the spiritual nature of the soul; but in Jesus this last was all-powerful over the first. Who is it in science who has said that the reproduction of human life or animal life is known to be possible in very low insect or worm life? If it is *possible at all* in earthly life, no matter how low, science cannot say that it is impossible. We know not yet all the laws of nature, though we know that God is all-powerful, and, therefore, if life can be reproduced without the

two sexes, why doubt that so was Jesus born into the world?

Page 252. "Jesus never thought to pass himself as an incarnation of God; this idea was totally foreign to the Jewish mind." We say, yes, this was so; but such a thing could not be, as God could not have anything to do with the flesh and blood body of this earth, which is Satan's. But it is a different thing that the strong Spirit of God had a great deal to do with the birth of Jesus into this world. Its being foreign to the Jewish mind is just the reason; and Renan might have seen this, which made it true, for Renan has shown us before, that this Jesus completely upset all the old Jewish ideas, and gave them new ones. Here we have a note of Renan's, which is Strauss' influence, and which is straining history, to disprove this; and in another place another account, which contains the massacre of the innocents, and the arrival of the wise men at Jerusalem, at the time of the earthly birth of Jesus. What could be more true to history than the order of Herod to massacre the children who were of the

age which he thought was the age of the child who was to be "King of the Jews?" If this be not the true reason, history, and Renan, or *Strauss*, should have given us the true reason before trying to take away the Biblical one, which seems to us the most historical that could be given; and as Strauss thinks it was only chance which brought the wise men from the East to Jerusalem at that time, he should have told history *who* the person was they had come to worship. True history should not leave anything in the dark. We, therefore, believe these two accounts to be strictly historical.

Page 254. Renan here takes this idea from the disciples of Jesus. We think it is best to take only the words of Jesus and think them out. It was because the Spirit of God was so strong in Jesus that he felt it was the Sonship of God.

Page 255. "We must remember that Jesus and those who heard him had no idea that the laws of nature could mark the limit of the impossible." We say that nothing is impossible to God, and that here Renan is only thinking

about what we *know* of the laws of nature; every day we are learning more and more about the laws of nature and they have no limit.

Page 257. "There was for Jesus no supernatural, as for him there was no nature." We think that in these words Renan shows that Jesus was more than human; if for Jesus there was no nature, then he was Divine.

Page 260. "Jesus never pretended that he created the world nor that he governed it; he is to judge it and renew it." Here we agree; for this world is Satan's, and all in it has been his, and all human nature with its evils was created by Satan. Jesus in the Spirit will judge the spirits of this world.

Page 261. Renan shows how the disciples of Jesus, in their account in the Gospels, prove that Jesus acted wholly as man. This we understand to be the human nature of Jesus, for he was of mankind, happily for us, as otherwise Jesus could not be our intercessor. The Spirit is not flesh and blood, and it was only by dwelling in a flesh and blood body, and overcoming the

evils thereof, that Jesus became the Saviour of mankind.

Page 264. All these things which Renan here speaks of worked for their day. Now we have more light, and by that light we are bound to work for our day, clearing the way for the light yet to come to this earth in days which are to come after our day.

Page 265. "Jesus was convinced that the prophets wrote of him." It was Jesus who said: "Search the Scriptures, for they are they which testify of me;" and to us they are very plain, though Renan thinks that it is difficult to see their meaning, or their connection with the life of Jesus.

Page 267. To our mind what Renan here says about the miracles of Jesus is a great mistake, for we believe that all the miracles of Jesus were performed by his knowledge of laws of which we know nothing as yet. Prayer for help and faith that by knowledge the thing can be done give mankind power over nature, that is, power to use the laws of nature so as to govern or control her. When man by study finds out new

laws, as science is doing year by year, he learns totally new things, so astonishing to him, that he should not be surprised at anything which he sees is wholly God's law.

Why, then, be surprised at what is called the miracles of Jesus? For by his knowledge of God's laws in nature, he worked what were then called miracles. Jesus was, as Renan says, so far *above* mankind that there never was and never will be another man like him.

Page 269. Renan thinks that those who lived in Jesus' days on this earth thought more of his miracles than of his teachings and predictions, and that the last were profoundly Divine. Here Renan sees the Divine in Jesus.

Page 270. Renan says that there was no science in medicine in Judea when Jesus was there; that the scientific medicine founded by Greece was unknown to the Jews in Palestine, and that Jesus cured the diseases by the contact of his touch. This we know was so. At the same time, Jesus must have known even better than the scientists of Greece, how to cure diseases. We think what Renan here says is almost cowardly,

for he allows the possibility of the magnetic influence of a woman over a man, but tries to prove that a Divine influence was not in Jesus. Now, he has said elsewhere in his book that Jesus was perfect in person and charmingly winning, drawing all persons to him; as such Jesus was, we say, undoubtedly full of Divine influence, and by his touch cured many who were sick, and brought back to this life many who had left it in spirit. Now, it seems to us that Renan wrote this, letting his French nature control him. If woman has this influence over men or others, she bears a heavy responsibility, and is guilty or otherwise, in God's sight, according as she uses her power. We are thankful that all human nature does not yield itself to this influence in woman, and that all women do not use it, even if they know that they have it. It is in human nature an *unholy* influence, and Satan uses it to the peril of our souls. By it, mankind fell; by it, envy, murders, thefts and all sins come; woe to those who not only yield to it, but encourage and promote it, glory in it, and who cannot realize that it is their shame, that they willingly place their souls,

that spark from Heaven, under the heel of their body of flesh, which is a descendant of animal life and a direct descendant from the devil, as science has proved. Can any woman hope that her soul can live in Heaven after the death of her body, if she has degraded it to see good in this terrible evil, the curse which rests on mankind and which multiplies evil in this terrible world? They send down to posterity the evils and sins which they have fostered in their human bodies of flesh and blood. Jesus has shown us how we should use the influence within us for good to others and not for evil. Remember that he was man the same as others, and that he has told us that the Divine in us, which is our souls from Heaven, can be permitted to grow, if only we will it, until we conquer the flesh, which is of Satan.

Page 272. Here we have the belief that demons possessed those who were out of their right minds. We wish Renan could have explained why a crazy person is no longer responsible for his actions. We ourselves think that when the mind, being connected with the soul,

is once deadened, human nature shows its origin —that is, it is of Satan, uncontrolled by the soul; it shows its true nature. As to hysterics in women, they are in nine cases out of ten, voluntary at first, a confirmed habit afterwards, very disgraceful to the sex, and one which could be completely checked by the will of the victim. She who indulges in hysterics deserves no compassion, or pity, or indulgence from others, as they are wholly under her own control—at least, always so at first. This may also be said of a woman who permits herself to faint.

Page 279. How could Renan class St. Bernard and St. François d'Assise with Jesus? It is Renan's Roman Catholic Church training which has made him do this. We Protestants would not think of doing so.

Page 286. These prophecies, spoken by the Master, were parables, and have a spiritual meaning. They were not taken "a la lettre" by Jesus, though the disciples may have done so. The fall of the angels, here spoken of in a note, was the fall of Adam and Eve, created in the flesh by Satan; they were his descendants. Jesus

said he saw Satan fall from Heaven. Satan, we think, sinned in creating; he only created evil, and that evil is in the body of flesh and blood.

Page 287. "The time is near." This, we think, means the time was near when the soul of mankind gained its liberty over the flesh by the Spirit of Jesus.

Page 289. "Some will not die before the kingdom of the Son of Man comes." This, we think, means that they will see that the belief in Jesus will spread to other countries. And here Renan does not understand Jesus, for he judges him as a man alone, and forgets the Divine in him. Time, as spoken of here, is not our little time of life.

Page 291. "Jesus excludes marriage in the resurrection; the difference in sex will exist no more, for mankind will resemble angels." We think that the soul passing from the body which dies, may be the resurrection; it may be also being born again. We see nothing strange in the resurrection of the body, since all things which die on the earth, and are buried there, live again in some other form; but marriage between

the sexes, which on this earth is the cause of increasing sin and evil, by multiplying wicked mankind, will cease forever.

Page 294. Here is a strange combination in Renan's thoughts. First he tells us that each one of us owes to Jesus what there is best in us, which is true; but if Jesus was only man, like other men, how could we owe to him what is best in us, for that best is spiritual and not carnal. Then Renan says that we must pardon Jesus his hope of coming again to the earth on the clouds of the sky, and that this dream of Jesus may have given him his strength against death. We think when Renan wrote the last of this that he was under the influence of Strauss. The words, *pardon Jesus*, are almost blasphemous. Are we to pardon the man whom we put to death? What man pleaded for the life of Jesus? It is a different thing in these days, when we can *see* the results of the life of Jesus, to say that we would not have put Jesus to death, but which man among us would at that time have had the courage to plead for the life of Jesus? If there is no man who would have done it then, we are still

of those who put Jesus to death. Who then is the one to *pardon?* Jesus or ourselves? The strength with which Jesus met suffering and death, was the strength of the Spirit of God, in that he was the Son of God. By conquering death for us, he was victor of Satan, for Satan created death, and our bodies of flesh, being of Satan, must die. But as Jesus died in the flesh for us, he was victor in the fight of soul against flesh, and so has given to our souls the life everlasting.

Page 296. "His Kingdom of God." The Kingdom of God can only be a kingdom of souls.

Page 300. Here we return to a true understanding of Jesus. "The Socialists of our days will found nothing lasting until they are guided by the true Spirit of Jesus—the principle that to possess the earth, we must renounce it."

Page 308. Renan tells us that Béelzébub was an ancient god of the Philistines, transformed by the Jews into a demon, also that Jesus said that every time that mankind assembles in his name he will be among them. This presence of Jesus is spiritual.

Page 309. Renan mentions that Jesus spoke plainly when he forbade divorce.

Page 312. Here we find that some of the disciples left Jesus because they could not understand the spiritual in what he spoke to them.

Page 313. In all of this is the Divine nature of Jesus, and it is for us to find the spiritual meaning in these words of his.

Page 317. The Lord's Supper, which we call the Communion, the bread and wine, we think, means his human life given for us; he is in that way our nourishment. It is the Christian passover; for Jesus' sake God will pass over our sins in the flesh, that is, we who are Christ's.

Page 318. "The spirituality of Jesus was so great that the body counted for nothing." We think this is a strong proof that the soul within Jesus was direct from God, the Son of God.

Page 321. "If your hand offend you cut it off, etc." This can only have a spiritual meaning. What sins you have, what faults you have, which are pleasing to you, give them up, no matter what it may cost you.

Page 322. "Jesus strongly preached war

against human nature." We think that Jesus meant that if our souls prefer earthly things to Heavenly things we will lose the life of our souls, and certainly if we cultivate pleasure and love for carnal things, we will be all carnal, and that which is carnal dies; nothing should be first but the life of our souls, for the soul does not die; but if that which is carnal comes first we stunt the soul.

Page 323. "The Son of Man will appear." We think this means the belief in Jesus will appear.

Page 325. "If any one comes to me and does not hate father, mother, etc." In a note Renan says we must remember the exaggerated style of Luke. We would say that the word hate is the only exaggerated part of this. It means that where your treasure is there will your heart be. Christ as the Spirit of God should be first in our hearts and he should be our treasure. Renan goes on to say that Jesus, at this time, had a disgust for the world, and that he had a grand presentiment which threw him more and more beyond humanity. We think this last a strong

proof of the Divine in Jesus, and we can understand his disgust for this world, for the strong, pure Spirit of Jesus must have been disgusted with the animal nature of this world. He had become man to save man, and he knew now the utter vileness of human nature. His soul was longing to throw off the human nature in which he dwelt; pure as that human body was, it was flesh and blood, the same as ours, and created by Satan. The contact alone with mankind could not be anything to Jesus, but "*âpre et triste de dégoût pour le monde.*"

Page 326. Two anecdotes—the man who wished first to bury his father; the other who having put his hand to the plough should not look back. We understand these two things to mean spiritual thoughts; Jesus knew what was in the thoughts of these two men. The first command was to leave the customs of the law to those who lived under the law, and cared most for it, and to go and preach that God is above the law. The second, was *not* to think more of one's earthly possessions than of preaching the Kingdom of God; if one's affections returned to his earthly

possessions, he was not fit to preach the Kingdom of God.

Page 327. "Jesus said, 'Come to me and I will give you rest—'" Which means that the burdens of this life will appear light, if we value this life less than the life to come.

Page 329. "Death presented itself to Jesus as a sacrifice, to appease the Father and save men." We do not here agree with Renan, for Jesus said that offenses must come to him. It was not to appease God, it was that, having taken a human body, Jesus knew that the human body must die like all human bodies, for mankind is Satan's, and Satan created death.

Page 331. "The relations of Jesus at times thought that he was not in his right mind." This was because they could not understand Jesus. Even in these days, if anyone has an idea beyond the understanding of the common mind, they say that person is crazy.

Page 332. "The dislike that Jesus had to all opposition, carried him into acts which are inexplicable and in appearance absurd." We think that here Renan was under the influence of

Strauss. We understand the parable of the fig-tree to mean that if a person, who *pretends* to be holy, and appears so to the world, when examined by the Spirit of God, shall have *no fruit* to show that the appearance was true, that person will be withered away by the Word of God, which will try him. And Jesus taught his disciples to understand these things, by using earthly examples to impress the lesson on their minds. "Jesus revolted from the contact of this earth." We understand this, for this earth is Satan's, and Jesus was fighting Satan for our souls.

Page 333. "It was time that the death of Jesus should come, for the situation was strained." Renan here forgets that Jesus knew the hour of his death in the human body, for he told of it to his disciples long before there was any positive sign that the people would put him to death.

Page 340. "To know that one has for a moment touched the ideal and to be stopped by others, is insupportable to an ardent soul. What must it have been to the founder of a new world?" To acknowledge this is to acknowledge that Jesus was more than merely man.

Page 342. "Jesus would have only the religion of the heart; the religion of the Pharisees was wholly one of ceremony." How many religions of these days are free from ceremonies?

Page 346. "It was a new spirit which had come to this world, and which caused a falling away of all that had gone before it." We would say here that Satan's children, of course, will always fight against the Spirit of God. Jesus, as that Spirit, came to tell those who dwelt in bodies of flesh and blood that there was a Spirit of life within them, which was able to conquer the natural body; that body is the child of Satan.

Page 347. "But it was also just that this great Master should in irony pay for his triumph by his death." We see no justice in this, that Jesus must die. He said that no one could put him to death unless it was his own will, and the will of God, that it should be so. Death must come to the human body, and Jesus died of his own free will.

Page 349. "Six months were yet to pass by, before the end." Here Renan tells us himself that Jesus knew the time of his death.

Page 350. "Jesus had no idea of the world, and at Jerusalem his speech must have appeared singular." Renan judges so by what we call in these days knowledge of the world, and forgets that Jesus did not need that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man; therefore Jesus was worldly-wise, and if in Jerusalem his words appeared singular, it was only because the Jerusalemites were incapable of understanding spiritual things, being so carnal in their nature.

Page 351. This is about the widow's mite. We do not understand these words of Jesus to mean that the poor, who give little, give more than the rich, who give much, but that God, who sees into the hearts of all, who knows the motive and the truth of what is within our power to give, will judge the gift from another standpoint than the one from which the world judges such things.

Page 352. Renan could not be more sarcastic to the world and to those who dwelt in Jerusalem in the day of Jesus, than to say what he says here. "The great moral elevation of Jesus

gave him but little advantage, what do I say? it created for him a sort of inferiority." Then the carnal animal flesh and blood bodies were incapable of understanding what was grandly moral, and added to their ignorance the sin of thinking Jesus even inferior to themselves.

Page 357. Renan does not seem to like that Jesus submitted to being questioned, as Matthew gives us in chap. 22, verse 36, and to the end of the chapter, and yet had Jesus not done so, we would not now have these answers, which are so very much to us. It was for our sakes, therefore, that Jesus submitted to answer his enemies.

Page 359. Here we find that a man has understood the passage in the Gospels of the woman taken in adultery, in the same light that we see it. This woman was taken before Jesus when he was in the temple, by the men of Jerusalem, in the hopes that he would tell them to stone her, according to the law of Moses; these men were determined to accuse Jesus of breaking that law of Moses if he did not say "Stone the woman." In our book, the "Origin of Sin," in the chapter on the women in the Bible, we give

an account of what Jesus said, in the light in which we see it. It has always been quoted as only referring to the woman, when in truth it refers wholly to the men alone. Renan says this. "But the spirit which is allied to moral grandeur, is the one that stupid people pardon the least. In pronouncing the words, which were of such just and pure taste, 'He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone,' Jesus pierced the heart of hypocrisy, and with the same blow he signed his death-warrant."

Page 363. We have here, "Woe to you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, for you take away the key of science and only use it to close the Kingdom of God to other men." This seems to us to be a proof that science belongs to religion.

Page 367. Renan speaks of the words of Jesus, "Destroy this temple and I will build it up in three days." Christ means his human body, and it is exactly what he did.

Page 371. "And where he (Jesus) had administered baptism." We do not see this in the Gospels, for we read that Jesus did not baptize, only his disciples baptized.

Page 378. Renan here shows that it was the Jewish priests who put Jesus to death, and Pilate was forced to yield.

Page 380. Renan says, "The unintelligible hate of the enemies of Jesus decided the success of his work and put the seal to his Divinity." Here Renan judges for himself.

Page 383. Renan speaks of the presentiments of Jesus. Presentiments are not certainties, and Jesus spoke so often of his death, that he must have been very certain of it.

Page 389. Here is a note speaking of St. John's Gospel "as being of such an exalted tone that he must only have seen the Divine in Jesus, and not the natural weakness spoken of in the other Gospels." These two things we see in this light: Jesus was human, and also Divine in Spirit.

Page 390. Renan here writes of the agony of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane. We believe this to be a terrible conflict between the human nature of Jesus and the Spirit of God within him, for Jesus, for our sakes, was then in the human body even as we are.

Page 391. "The man who has sacrificed to a grand idea his rest." Yes; but Jesus was more than man. The rest of this page is very French. Renan has already told us that Jesus would have nothing to do with earthly things, which we also see was so. Jesus could not regret this earthly life, since he refused to have anything to do with it, and his disciples could not then understand that the Spirit within Jesus was direct from God.

Page 392. "There remains only the incomparable hero of the Passion, the founder of the rights of free conscience." This is good, Renan; where, then, shall we look for true Christians? Among those whose consciences are tied, or among those whose consciences are free?

Page 411. Renan here speaks of the insults given to Jesus before his death. We think that these insults given to Jesus, when in his human body, were given by the children of Satan, and that Jesus permitted them as a proof that our human bodies deserve these sufferings, being descended from Satan. The strong Spirit

of God in Jesus was then passive; it was for this that Jesus had the conflict in the garden.

Page 413. This refers to Jesus before Pilate. We do not agree with Renan that the disciples could not have learned what was said; it was easy, after the death of Jesus, for anyone to have told the disciples what was said then.

Page 423. Renan here gives a very clear and just defence of Pilate, who was forced to put Jesus to death to please the Jewish priests. As Jesus himself said to Pilate: "Thou couldst have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above; therefore, he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin—" Pilate should not bear all the hate of the Christian world. As Renan says, the King of Spain, to please the clergy, put to death hundreds of his subjects and was more to be blamed than Pilate, as he had more power than Pilate had at Jerusalem. When the civil power persecutes to please the priests it shows its weakness, and Renan challenges the first government which is free from this sin, to throw the first stone at Pilate.

Page 425. Alas! all this is very true. We

can only think that the Christian religion was guilty of all this because it did not realize the spiritual idea of what Jesus came to teach us; besides, human nature is of Satan, and in it and from it there will always be war against the spiritual which we have from Christ.

Page 431. "No disciple was near Jesus in his last sufferings." But we are glad to know that many women braved the perils, and followed Jesus to his death.

Page 435. Here Renan shows us that if Pilate was forced by the Jews to put Jesus to death when he did not wish to do so, and when he had made an effort to save him, he, Pilate, took his revenge on the Jews by writing "The King of the Jews," so that all could see that the Jews had crucified their King. They said that Jesus had called himself the King of the Jews, and for that reason they demanded of Pilate his death, though they could not prove that he had said these words. We are glad to see these names, Mary Cleophas, Mary of Magdala, Jeanne, wife of Khouza, Salome here, for this testifies that these women had the courage to follow Jesus to

his death. It must be the women who give the account of the death of Jesus, as they were eye witnesses, and those who wrote the account do but give the words of these courageous and faithful women.

Page 437. "Perhaps Jesus repented that he died and suffered for so vile a race." Yes, we are truly vile, as the race by nature was and is the descendant of brute animal and animal is the descendant of Satan. Animals can only be tamed by being in contact with mankind in whom is the spark from God, and we are only tamed by being in contact with the Spirit of Jesus.

Page 438. "My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" We think that this was all *human*, as the Spirit of God cannot die, for what is of God cannot die. Jesus in his human nature must die as human man, and he tells us in these words that to accomplish this, God, or the Spirit of God, then left him and he felt as *man* what it is to be without God. Jesus, for us, suffered all that mankind in flesh and blood must suffer when without the Spirit of God. Here let us give the words of Renan. "Deeply united to his Father,

he commenced on the cross that Divine life which he was going to live in the hearts of humanity to endless years."

Page 441. "Between thee and God will be no distinction. Clearly the vanquisher of death, you take possession of the Kingdom in which will follow thee for centuries those who adore thee."

Page 446. The burial of Jesus. The women did what they could for Jesus and never feared the great dangers which they met. Mary of Magdala was the first witness of his resurrection.

Page 455. Alas! this is true, "bishops have been princes, and the pope a king," but we think that, at the end, we will find that those who were truly of Christ were not known to history.

Page 466. Renan says, "Very far from Jesus being created by his disciples, Jesus shows himself in every way superior to his disciples. These disciples, with the exception of St. Paul and perhaps John, were men without invention or genius. There is a great superiority in the Gospels over the other writings in the New Testament, and even the Evangelists themselves

are so far beneath him of whom they write, that they frequently disfigure their account, not being able to reach his great height. One can see, between the lines, a beautiful original Divinity, spoiled by those who wrote, and who did not understand him, and put their own ideas for those of Jesus." We fully agree with Renan that the disciples did not wholly understand the Divine words of Jesus which they have given to us, and we think that we should take these Divine words of Jesus and think out their spiritual meaning. We think that Jesus designedly gave them to "*men without invention or genius;*" so that, in a certain way, they will always remain pure, and be given to all generations, so that each generation can think out their truism aided by the new light constantly coming into this world through science.

Page 470. Here we do not agree with Renan, who says, "Jesus had an element of Buddhism, of Zoroaster, and Plato," for we think that all these had ancient predictions which referred directly to Jesus and His teachings. How is it

that Renan says this of Jesus after proving to us that Jesus must have been Divine?

Page 472. "Christianity has been going further and further away from the Jewish religion; it will become perfect when it begins to return to Jesus." We agree with this. We are not perfect Christians yet, since it is possible to say that we have yet to come back to Jesus. Renan means the simplicity, purity, truth, which was in Jesus.

Pages 474, 475. "Jesus is the only one who has made his species take the great step towards the Divine." Here we find that Renan thought as we do—that we are animals, only superior because our egotism is more thought out. We are sometimes surprised that people cannot realize the double nature of Jesus, and yet we all have a double nature much less strong. Our souls live a life within us, and our human bodies live another life. If we would permit it, the life of our souls would control the life of our bodies to a much greater extent than it does now. Jesus had such a strong soul or spirit that the human life of his body was in complete subjection to his

spirit, and that Spirit was direct from God, therefore Divine. We are surprised here, that Renan should speak of anyone as being near in any way to Jesus, for Jesus was human and divine.

APPENDIX.

Page 480. Renan says, "Why could not other men have visions the same as St. Paul?" We also say, that if Paul had what is called visions—in other words, a sudden conviction in his mind that a thing or idea is true—why cannot other Christians also have the same? For we can only know God through our souls, in other words, through an inward conviction. We can never know God through our human bodies, for our bodies are of Satan, and a thing in which there is *death* cannot know God. Our souls do not die, and through them we can know God.

Page 481. Renan thinks that John the Baptist had doubts who Jesus was, and for this reason sent others to question Jesus. We think

that John did this more to convince those whom he sent than to convince himself.

Page 491. We do not find it so hard to understand that Jesus should tell us that we must be born again, for surely our souls are born after the death of the body. They are born again by leaving the body, which is born into this world by the birth of the body, and the soul is born into the next world by the death of the body.

Page 530. "Mary of Magdala, who, according to the four texts, played an important part at the Resurrection, is not mentioned by St. Paul as among those who saw Jesus." We say this is because Paul was not an eye witness, and also because he did not understand what Jesus thought of women. Paul was hard in every way on women.

Page 532. Paul names a man as being the first to see Jesus after the Resurrection. This is because a woman was of no account to Paul, because she was a woman.

Page 533. This we do not understand. Why should Renan think that Jesus did not predict

his own resurrection, when he has shown us that Jesus was all spiritual?

And now we would say this much:—First, all honor to Renan for giving this book to the world, and in it his own thoughts on the life of Jesus. It is a book which cannot fail to do good, and is given to the world at a time when such writings are much needed. We owe Renan many thanks.

As a woman I thank him for what he says of his sister, and am glad that she helped him in writing his book and in thinking his thoughts of Jesus.

To woman in general we would say, *rejoice* that no *woman* had a hand in putting Jesus to death; but women had great courage in keeping with Jesus when he was led out of the city to die. And last, but by no means least, we find that no one pleaded for the life of Jesus except a woman, and she was the wife of Pilate. Owing to her pleadings Pilate made the effort he did to save the life of Jesus.

Page 441. Renan says that Jesus "was plainly

the vanquisher of death." If Renan means this literally, then he believed in the resurrection of Jesus in the human body, and if Jesus so vanquished death he did so for us, and the resurrection, in the human body of those who are Jesus' followers, must be a certain fact, to take place in a time yet to come. If Jesus vanquished death in relation only to our souls, then it is possible that the soul can die, and we owe the life of the soul to Jesus who vanquished death for us.

END OF THE ESSAY.

QUESTIONS.

We would ask those who say that they are made in the image of God, these few questions :— *First*, Was the clay or dust out of which Adam was made in any way different from the clay or dust out of which horses, monkeys, cats, dogs, serpents, and the rest of animal life was also made? If there is a difference, it is your duty to state the difference in the clay or dust of the ground which was used in both cases, and give to the world your knowledge about it.

Second, When you consider your own body—its needs, its functions, its shape, its want of power—do you have no higher idea of God than this? You are made, you say, in his image. Does God eat, drink, sleep, walk, and do all that your body is obliged to do so as to live? Can he see no further than you can? Does he talk, and smell odors, and speak as you do? Above all, does he *think* as you do? It is not we, but you, who say that your body is made in the image of God. If you cease to eat and drink, can you live in the body? What is it that God eats and drinks? Can he live if he ceases to eat, and drink, and sleep? It is not we, but you, who say that Adam was made in the image of God, the image being Adam's body of clay. Did Adam eat, and drink, and sleep before the time that you believe to be the time of the fall of man?

You have a strange idea of God, and you do not believe what Jesus has told you, that God is a Spirit.

Can you not understand that the Bible account of the fall of mankind is a symbol, with a deeper meaning than the mere words imply?

The Bible teaches us in the same way as we teach children—by object lessons, as they are the best way to make a child understand and remember what it is taught. It was thus that Christ taught his disciples. The fig-tree bearing leaves but no fruit, and withered away, was an object lesson, and there are many more such in the life of Jesus.

We will close our essay by saying that science is of God, for the reason that God is Truth, and all who honestly seek for truth are of God.

We find in our study of Renan's life of Jesus in the French, much that is reasonable and true, but we also find that Renan has been forced to allow that Jesus, when on this earth, was more than merely human. He found in the life of Jesus much that could not be accounted for historically, yet which could not be explained away. Above all, Renan is not ignorant of the great spiritual nature in Jesus, and he is obliged to allow that though he does not believe in the miraculous birth of Jesus, Jesus in his Spirit or Soul was not like other men.

Our idea of God is higher than his idea, for

we think that what is created by God cannot fall or change but by natural results of the laws of God. Then it would not be a fall by sin, or a fall of any kind from what science tells us of natural laws.

Therefore, God did not create us, for God did not create sin and evil. We differ from the animals only in that we have souls, and the soul must overcome the animal if the soul is to live and grow. The soul will not die, but it cannot grow unless it overcomes the animal. Rise, therefore, above the animal you dwell in, and make it obey you, and cease to obey it. Jesus came to teach us that this is possible. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, therefore, it dies; however, do not be deceived, for your soul does not die; but unless you let it grow in strength and know its Maker while you are here, how will it know its Maker when it leaves the animal it now dwells in? Emerson says a fence is always a challenge to a bright boy. We say it is also a challenge to a bright girl. We are fenced in by dogmas made by men. Let us climb the one which says that

flesh and blood is the image of God, and know that the soul alone is so.

Our authority for what we have written is, much study of the Bible, much thought on what we read there, an inward conviction, the study of many religious books, and the study of some scientific books.

ELECTRICITY IN MODERN LIFE,

BY

G. W. De TUNZELMANN.

[79]

ESSAY ON ELECTRICITY.

Have we electricity in our bodies, or does it only pass through us? On a cold day, if we walk quickly over a carpet and touch a metal, we see and hear and feel a spark of fire, which we say is electricity. We sleep in a cold room, and the woolen material that covers us, when touched or shaken, crackles with sparks which burn us. A woolen shawl with long woolen fleece does more than crackle, for in the dark it has, if we pass our hand over it, not only sparks but short flames of light which follow our fingers. If we brush our hair in cold weather, it stands straight up as stiff as wires, and cracks when turned down. On a cold day we are strong and can walk miles with ease; we take in the oxygen from the air as we breathe, and we have electricity within us.

Science tells us that silk and glass rubbed with sealing-wax or resin, either attract or repulse electricity, and that a flannel object retains electricity and will attract and repel. Wax is from a bee, a live bee ; resin is from a tree ; silk from the silk worm ; all these must be alive to make the wax, the resin, the silk. Science tells us that electrifying a body adds a certain something to it, and that electrifying it negatively takes the same amount of that something from it. Science also says that we know absolutely nothing of what electricity really is, yet we say that when electricity takes place, something occurs like the transference of an incompressible liquid from one place to another. Science also says that if the electrical machine is to continue to give a supply of electricity, its rubber must be in connection with earth. It is also not determined about the direction or the flow, and we are totally ignorant of the velocity of flow.

We would ask what metals are in the earth. Electricity, we are told, is made of solutions of potash, sulphuric acid, zinc, carbon, and also

iron wire. We are told that if enough electricity is used, heat is developed.

Electricity is life, but not our bodily life, though we live by it as we also live by oxygen; not only mankind, but everything in which there is life, on the earth, also lives by it. Too much of either will kill the life of our bodies, but not the true life within us, which is the life of our souls. It is not everyone that can live on high mountains; the air is too rarefied for some lungs; powerful electricity is deadly to our bodies, but God's agent is electricity; by it work the sun, the earth, the planets, the stars, earthquakes, cyclones, storms; by it lives everything that is made of earth; everything that touches or grows on this earth; everything that owes its birth to the laws of this earth.

Our souls are electricity, such is their life, such is the nature of God. No one in the flesh can see God and live, the flesh would die by an electric flash, the same as by a lightning flash when it strikes. If we get the electricity which is in us from the earth it is because we are made of earth, and because the same metals which are

in the earth are in us and connect us by electricity to the earth. Our bones are composed of minerals and phosphate of lime; in our bodies we have common salt and iron, also sulphur, potash, carbon and soda, and phosphorus in the brain tissue. All these we get from the earth in various ways. All these minerals are used in medicines to restore our bodies to health. Now, if phosphate comes from volcanic rocks of the earth, and, decaying, passes into the soil, from thence to plants, wheat, corn and oats, and if animals, eating these things, get phosphate in their systems, and if mankind eating both animals, wheat, corn and oats, also get this phosphate, which, we are told, is a faint light without heat, and if phosphate makes the brain tissue, then phosphate is, we say, part of electricity. Electricity, which can give great light, is the life of this world, the life of all in the world, and the life of our souls. Our souls, which are only connected with our brains, are light, and this light was strong in Jesus; by being so, he was the Light of this world, light to our minds and souls. Having in us the metals which are in the

earth, we are so connected with the earth from which we spring, that we are drawn by electricity to it, and our bodies in the flesh return to the earth. "Dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return." Genesis 3 : 19.

Electricity draws us and all things to the earth, it is the magnet called gravitation. Oxygen gives us life; of a very cold, dry day, when the air is full of oxygen, so are we full of it, and also full of electricity and strength; we can walk, run, almost fly, with beautiful health rushing through our bodies of clay. Great oxygen and electricity are the life of our souls. The electricity which attracts or repels in wax, resin, silk and wool, all comes from the earth; it comes through the life of the bee, the tree and the silkworm; it lives on the sheep and the grass which the sheep live on. The electricity made by the minerals taken from the earth also comes from the life in the earth, and the life of this earth is electricity.

The certain something which science cannot explain, but which it tells us electricity adds to a thing, is simply the substance which makes

intensity of life, such as our souls are made of. It is such intense life that it can move inanimate objects, as science shows, but it passes off when electrified negatively, because, where it does not find life it cannot remain; it is, as science says, like an incompressible liquid, and we know nothing of the direction or velocity of the flow. No, we cannot, for we know not now the direction or the velocity of the flow of the true life, the life of our souls. Electricity certainly comes from the earth, through all things which have any amount of life, or the least amount of life; it is life, but a life of which we can hold but a small amount. We and the earth cannot live without heat, and electricity gives heat. The lodestone is made of iron metal and gas oxygen. If we have the same metal in us, and we know we have oxygen, then, as the earth is full of this mineral, we are attached to it by its large lodestones; all on the earth are so attached, drawn down by the earth. Science tells us that magnetism will change a body or thing magnetized. The cures which Jesus made were done

by magnetism, or, rather, electricity, but we will speak of them further on.

Science tells us that the current of magnets will flow round like the hands of a watch. We believe, then, that electricity flows round the earth or the earth revolves on its axis by electricity. Electricity, then, is the life in the world and the heavens. Science tells us that when work is done upon a body by electricity, that the body is afterwards capable of doing the same amount of work which has been done on it. We read in a Book—which we insist has as much right to be believed as any historical book —written years ago, that when the leper said to Jesus, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," Jesus put forth his hand and touched him, saying, "I will, be thou clean," and the leper was cleansed.

When Jesus was in Peter's house he saw his wife's mother sick of a fever, and he touched her hand and the fever left her. Now we also say, that as Jesus cured by electricity, he gave the electricity to the body and it did the work of curing the body. As Jesus was the perfection of

manhood, and had all the knowledge of the natural powers of this earth, he had them at his command. Therefore, at his command, electricity worked, as we do know now, though but faintly. He also cured without a touch of his hand, but by the touch of electricity, that incompressible liquid, as science calls it. Jesus cured the centurion's servant at Capernaum. The centurion tells us that he understands the power of Jesus over nature, for he says, "Speak the word only and my servant shall be healed, because I am under authority,"—that is, I have authority and so hast thou. "I have soldiers under me"—so had Jesus powers like electricity which he could work and command as soldiers. "Go, come, and do this," and the centurion adds, "he doeth it."

In the same way Jesus brought the calm to the waves which arose by a tempest. Science tells us that electricity attracts and repels according to the flow of the current. Electricity is life, not the life in us, but the life of this world. We believe Jesus to be man in his human body such as we are, but so far above mankind that in him

could dwell all this knowledge which was given to him by God, given to him to show us the way back to God as we knew it not ourselves. Jesus has told us that we ourselves can do as he did, had we the faith to gain the knowledge from God, by our minds and souls.

The energy derived from the sun is electricity, and it gives its intense light and heat the same way as our small electricity. Our earth is filled with electricity, and the earth and the sun repel and attract each other. We have been studying "Electricity in Modern Life," by G. W. de Tunzelmann. He says that in the Middle Ages the magnet was used as a power to cure all ills. We wish to say that we do not mean that such is the way that Jesus cured the sick; we mean that the electricity passed from Jesus himself, or through him into the person or thing which was corrected or made straight by the electricity. Also we read in the same book that "the first suggestion of an electric telegraph was made in an anonymous letter published in a magazine, signed with the letters 'C. M.,' and that the author's reason for concealing

his identity was the fear of being regarded as a magician by his neighbors." As this was in 1753, we think it may have been a woman. The fear of giving her full name we can well understand, for a woman had many things to fear in giving any thought whatever to the world then.

We also see in this fact that the power of working new and strange things, which rests in electricity, is like magic, and magic means sorcery to those who do not understand the power of electricity. The cures of Jesus were in those days attributed to magic or sorcery by those who were his enemies (Matthew 12 : 24)— "But when the Pharisees heard it they said, this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils." In our study we also read, "The electrical phenomena presented by the tissues of the living animal body, obscure as the subject is, deserve a brief mention, especially as electricity is now so largely used in the treatment of various diseased conditions." We would say that to Jesus these things were not obscure; he knew the animal

body, and saw and knew how to use electricity in the cures which he made. Electricity being in us, and in all things, he could connect the great flow of it, which passed through his body, to the flow in the patient's body, just enough to cure and less than would kill.

We have in "Electricity in Modern Life" an account of the phonograph, and how wax is used in making it. We have always thought that this explains how what we *hear* when very young, returns to us in after years. We speak to a child, it hears with its ears, in which is some wax; the brain receives what the ears hear, and in after years or old age the brain repeats the first impressions which were made by the wax on the brain. We should be careful, then, how we instruct very young children.

To explain how light is made by electricity, we refer you to the book we have studied. But we have something more to say from the very old Book which we have also studied. When Moses, with the message which God had given him, came down from the high mountain where he had been for some time, in air full of oxygen,

which is life and electricity, which is *light*, the face of Moses shone so that Aaron and all the Children of Israel were afraid to come nigh him, and Moses had to wear a veil over his face, until that light faded away. Exodus 34.

So also we understand the Transfiguration of Jesus, "And his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Jesus was on a high mountain in oxygen and electricity from God. Jesus was in contact with the souls of Moses and Elias, souls of oxygen, *strong life*, and electricity, strong *white light*—the life and light from God which, in its strength, would kill our bodies of flesh in a moment. The bright cloud from which the voice came saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him," and which was so *bright*, that the disciples fell on their faces and were sore afraid, was also electricity and conveyed the sound of the words to the disciples. We have taken these accounts from Matthew, since Renan and Strauss say that they consider the book of Matthew the most reliable.

We must here say that our bodies, made of

clay and of earthly metals, are from the earth, and that in the temptation given in Matthew, the devil said to Jesus, when he showed him the kingdoms and glories of this world, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." They were things which were then in the *power of the devil to give*, and they were things of this earth. We, then, in the flesh are all evil and sin; our souls alone have light. The flesh is of the earth; the soul is electricity or light. Jesus was on a high mountain; by electricity he saw the glory of the world.

CHRISTIANITY
AND ROMAN PAGANISM,

BY

PROFESSOR ST. GEORGE MIVART,

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY,

NOVEMBER, 1893.

[95]

CHRISTIANITY AND ROMAN PAGANISM.

Having read the above, we here present our view of it. Mr. Mivart tells us that the purpose of this article is not to define the essence of Christianity, but to note certain characteristics which history shows us, by contrast, to have pertained to the essence of that religion. It is *history* again that is presented to us here.

We find that pagan religions were aids to the Christian church, to the church and not to the religion, and we find it very difficult to understand why *Christian* is added to it. The Romans were a people who, in spite of their bravery, were more given to *fear* than to hope. We find that the Roman Church in these days rules its

people more by *fear* than by hope, and also that they are taught to dread the God they worship.

Mivart tells us that the Romans had a god called Vaticanus, who caused the new-born infant to emit its first cry. This, he says, is a matter-of-fact god. Certainly it is a matter of fact that the new-born infant does give a first cry, and we consider this cry to be caused by its first breath, which is the spark from God, or the soul of the infant, whose body is of animal descent born into this world of Satan. The cry is the cry of the soul sent to fight its battle against sin, the world, and the devil, by overcoming the body of sin in which it first sees the darkness of this earth.

Mivart tells us that Romanists had not that tendency to humanize their gods, which prevailed in Greece. If they had not—which statement we do not dispute, as we accept the history that Mivart here gives us—why, we ask, do the modern Romans make human beings gods after their death? We refer to the saints in the Roman Catholic churches. No one who has lived in Italy or Rome can deny that some years back the common, ignorant people of that church wor-

shipped the statues and pictures of the saints, as if they were living human gods.

We understand the Greeks to have humanized their gods, because when the descendants of animals changed in their outward forms of flesh and blood, and their souls began to awake to consciousness, they felt the need of a god to worship, a god like unto their souls. Before Christ came to tell them of the God of their souls, they made gods for the needs of their bodies. The man who loved wine made a god of Bacchus, god of wine. They had a god of carnal love, Cupid; a goddess of beauty, Venus; a being or god of heaven, Jupiter; a queen, Juno; a god of rivers, Alpheios; a god of trees, Dryads; a god of fire, Vulcan; a god of the seas, Neptune; a goddess of the chase, Diana; and a great many others, all referring to the needs of the body. We will here mention that Minerva, goddess of wisdom, said to have been born from the brain of Jupiter, the king of heaven, was a goddess, not a god. They understood that wisdom comes from the brain, and that wisdom itself is of God.

Mivart tells us that this religion of Rome, so powerful, was incorporated with the state. We say so has the Roman Catholic Church religion been for many years, until, like all things run to evil for selfish motives, it is on the wane.

The religion of the pagan consisted in external worship, which had to be carried out with precision, with proper attitudes, due offerings and correct formulæ; these worshippers of the gods had two priests beside them when they prayed. All these pagan customs with their exact meanings are, at this day, adopted into the Roman Church, and are not, to our mind, Christian, that is, according to the teachings of Christ. We find in one of the parables of Jesus that the Pharisee prayed thus within himself, "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are; I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all I possess." This precision was not praised by Jesus, as proper attitudes, due offerings and external acts, may be proper discipline, but are of no value to the soul.

The pagans had no dogmas; men's thoughts and beliefs were free, and only external acts

were demanded of them; of the priests or pontiffs, neither their morals nor beliefs were taken into account. So it is in the Roman Church now, though it has dogmas; the external acts of the dogmas are considered sufficient; what the man thinks or believes in his soul, and what his private morals may be, are not taken into account. This is not Christian, for Christ taught, "If you do your alms to be seen of men, you have no reward of your Father in Heaven; if you make them known, you are as the hypocrites; and when you pray, do not be as the hypocrites; they stand in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets to be seen of men; and when you pray use not vain repetitions; and the hypocrites are like sepulchres beautiful without, but *within* full of all uncleanness." Jesus taught just the reverse of all these pagan teachings adopted into the Roman Church. These outward forms, he told us, were nothing in God's sight. The inward soul, the mind, the thought, the private life, morals, sincere love to God, these were the things which make true religion.

Mivart speaks of the widely diffused feeling,

then existing; that a time of crisis had arrived, and that philosophers were preparing the way for Christianity by evolving from the old pagan world *ideas* and sentiments which facilitated its reception. We say that this is true of the Roman Catholic Church since it has kept so many pagan customs; but it is not true of the religion of Christ. All these pagan things he destroyed in declaring the life of the soul, and the impossibility of these earthly things having a saving effect upon it. The easy conquest that the Roman Church made of the poor, the despised, the ill-treated, the unhappy, was only because it kept them all in gross ignorance and superstition. Christ came to give these very same unhappy people a knowledge of what is true, and thereby to make them free. Ignorance and superstition are slavery, and by keeping the masses of the people in gross ignorance the Roman Church has treated them as slaves; she knows the value of forced ignorance, and as her leaders are by no means ignorant themselves, and know full well what they are doing, they will be judged accordingly. All usurped earthly

powers used for evil, sooner or later come to their end. Mivart says that the emancipation of women was accomplished before the Christian religion. We know this, but we also know that the Roman Catholic religion, which took the teachings of Paul, instead of the teachings of Christ, did away with the emancipation of women, and threw a yoke on them, more bitter to bear, and more unjust, than any pagan yoke. It ignored all that Christ taught on the subject of women, and for this act, we pronounce the Roman Catholic Church, unchristian. It has very little of the pure religion of Christ.

Mivart tells us that the pagan world believed that each state had a supernatural patron. The Roman religion has patron saints; we see nothing of the kind in the religion of Christ. Mivart also tells us how processions wound their way through the streets of pagan Rome; so they do now in the streets of Roman Catholic Rome. He tells us of the pardons granted in return for ceremonial observances; we find that the Rome, which says she is Christ's, does the same thing now; she grants spiritual pardons for money

paid to her priests. Trembling sinners in pagan Rome practiced fastings and sacrifices to disarm Divine justice; so they still do in the Roman Church, not understanding that their sufferings are the natural results of their sins, their ignorance and superstitions, which places them in the power of evil.

Mivart says, "To-day the Roman Church differs from all other religious bodies by these marks: (1) catholicity and (2) authority. There is not one other religious body which dares to affirm that it *alone* is catholic; and that it *alone* possesses *absolute* dogmatic authority." This, we say, is the declaration of a Roman Catholic.

First, as to other churches of Christ daring to affirm that they alone have absolute authority, they are too much of Christ, to do anything of the kind; to God they give absolute authority as expressed through Christ. If the Roman Church dare affirm that it alone possesses absolute dogmatic authority, it may so affirm it; but we do not admit it. Their declaring this by no means makes it so. Their pagan church is not Christ's church. They declare themselves

to be the woman arrayed in purple and scarlet in St. John's Revelations. "The woman he saw drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus. The seven heads are the seven mountains on which the woman sitteth; These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them, for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings. And the woman is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

When we look into history, which Mivart has forgotten to do, we find in what way the Roman Catholic dogmas possessed *absolute authority*, and we pray that God in the judgment may have mercy upon them. The Inquisition will rise up in condemnation against them for the blood shed, the cruel horrors practiced to gain this false authority, the falsehoods they taught, the ignorance they forced on mankind, the morals of the wicked leaders of their dogmas, their ignorance of the spiritual teachings of Christ, the earthly kingdom they held, which was of the earth's, and Satan's, for Christ declared that his kingdom was *not* of this earth. The Roman

Church took the earthly kingdoms which Christ refused when Satan told him that they were his —Satan's. And if the Roman Church has them, it can only have them from Satan, and they glory in this shame. As to their being alone catholic, we deny this altogether, for catholic means universal, and the Roman Church is *not* universal.

We also find in reading what Mr. Mivart here says, that St. Paul made the Roman Catholic Church. We say that he did not make it as it now stands, because so much is added to the beliefs of that Church by every Pope, during his lifetime, that St. Paul would hardly recognize it in these days. Though we allow that there is much that is good in St. Paul's writings, we take our view of the life of Christ and his teachings direct from the words of Jesus; and the essence of the religion of Christ, we do not find in the Roman Catholic Church, and very little of the true essence in St. Paul's writings. Christ was spiritual, and all his teachings are directly against dogmas. That men should put faith in the saving of their souls by the use of earthly

customs and dogmas, was what Christ wished to overthrow. The authority that the Church of Rome claims is self-made authority, and being man-made, it will die out of itself. The reason that the Christian Church in Rome adopted so much that is pagan is because mankind is so inclined to worship idols; they seem not to understand that their souls are spirit, and not carnal as their bodies. We find that the Roman Church has completely lost the simplicity of Christ.

We would here add that they who are Christ's are in all churches and of all religions on this earth; they are mixed up with the *tares* which are in all religions, and we shall only know them and their numbers, when at the end the tares are separated from the good seed.

ESSAY ON THE "LIFE OF JESUS."

BY

DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS.

[109]

ESSAY ON STRAUSS' LIFE OF JESUS.

In his dedication Strauss says, "In dedicating this book to my brother I consider him a representative of the people. I may add that he has the still rarer capacity of seeing that there is no security in Germany, at least for political liberty and progress, until the public mind has been emancipated from superstition and initiated in a purely human culture." We say that human is animal; if the people study only that part of themselves, they will become only animal, and, with uncontrolled animal natures, they will quickly become as cruel as untamed animals. Expecting no hereafter, they will die as animals. They will live as animals, only for themselves, tearing down and devouring one another, hating one another, and quickly destroying the best of

human life. They will live in forests and waste places, and the best will die out at last.

It was the people whom Christ loved; he was always with the people; it was the people whom he taught; he thought them capable of understanding his spiritual teachings; it was the people whom he cured of foul diseases.

Those whom he cured, the blind and lame, and whom he brought back to life, were from the people. He answered the questions of the people when he refused to answer the wise of those days. He had nothing to do with the proud and learned. He lived with the people, he prayed for the people, he suffered and died for the people. Why, then, does Strauss try to make the people disbelieve in Jesus? Because the Roman Catholic Church, and perhaps other churches also, have invented superstitious stories so as to control the ignorant. In so doing the churches have lost the simple and pure truth of the life and teaching of Jesus, who, in his Spirit, was the Son of God. If the people follow Jesus here, they will be with him hereafter in the life eternal of their souls. We consider Strauss in-

competent to judge of the truth of the Gospels, because his hatred of the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, which he cannot separate from the truth of the life of Jesus, has made him show malice towards Jesus. He carries this feeling so far in his writings that we discredit almost every word that he has written in his "Life of Jesus." We consider the book an unfair judgment of the Gospels, which he has studied as history, and which are not history, but a biography of the life of Jesus, who, in his lifetime here, refused to have anything to do with the history of this earth. Jesus was spiritual, and his teachings were spiritual. He told us of our souls, and if there was any history in his teachings, it was the history of the soul.

We now come to Strauss' preface to his new life of Jesus. Having read his first book on the life of Jesus, we read this preface with surprise, and even with some relief. The first book of the life of Jesus seemed to our mind to have but one object, the destruction of the Christian religion. Strauss tried to prove historically that all that we believe to be true in the life of Jesus, had no

truth in it at all. If this should be universally believed, this earth would become what hell is generally believed to be, and any man trying to bring this state of things about, cannot expect that we should either thank or love him.

We are neither French nor German; we belong to a free country. We think Renan's life of Jesus more noble than Strauss' life of Jesus, simply because Renan's book shows clearly that his soul loved the Spirit of God in Jesus, and Strauss' book shows almost hatred of Jesus.

INTRODUCTION.

Strauss here says, "Struggles between the senses and the reason, between selfish and general aims, are incidental to every human life, and, although the disturbance arising from this inward warfare may vary infinitely in degree, from the wildest tumult of the passions to the insignificant interruption of their repose, still its absolute exclusion, as supposed in the church doctrine, as to the sinlessness of Christ, must be fatal to any true conception of humanity." We

would answer Strauss in these words:—To be sinless means, in Jesus, that in the flesh he did not yield to sin, and that, having overcome it once, it never overcame him. Your own argument about degrees is against what you wish to prove, for all nature, or humanity, as you call it, is the same. If there are degrees you will have to allow that the humanity of Jesus, when he had conquered it in the temptation which he suffered, was, after the temptation, sinless. It is St. Paul who says, "For he (God) hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Also, "For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Now, we take the liberty of differing from St. Paul; he understood the Christian religion as he was capable of understanding it. We have the Gospels, which must give us our knowledge of the life and teachings of Christ, the same as Paul received his knowledge from the Gospels, written or told to him by the apostles. We have a right to search for the truth in

the Gospels. We find there that all are born in sin; mankind is born in sin.

We say that God did not make Jesus to *be sin* for us. Sin is not of God, but of Satan. God has nothing to do with sin, but to condemn it and refuse it. He never made a person or a thing to be sin. Jesus came to dwell in a human body such as we dwell in, a body of flesh and blood, whose nature is sin. That Jesus "knew no sin," means that he committed none, for Jesus knew what it was, as he came to condemn it, and as he tells us what it is, and how to overcome it. We cannot be made the "righteousness of God," for how can sin ever become the righteousness of God? St. Paul here makes human nature equal to God, which we never can be, even when we drop this body and live in our soul life. St. Paul would have us believe that the means of our being equal to God is *sin*, and sin made by God. No, we do not agree in this with St. Paul.

Then St. Paul, after telling us this, says that our High Priest can be touched with our infirmities, as he was in all points tempted as we are. This contradicts the first statement, for he says

here, that Jesus had our infirmities, and was tempted as we are, and he adds, "yet without sin." He means, we suppose, *without sinning;* for to be without sin means not knowing what sin is, and unless Jesus knew in the flesh and blood body, in which he dwelt here, what sin is, he could not be the "*daysman*" which Job longed for, "to be betwixt us; that might lay his hand upon us both." Job 9: 33. Jesus was, and is, the "daysman," to lay his hand upon us and upon God. That is, he connects us with God; being man in his body, such as we all are, and being the Son of God, in his soul or spirit, he was fit in spirit to approach us in our soul or spirit, with God.

Strauss says this: "Thus the discordant elements, human and Divine, the matter and the mode of treatment, became virtually decomposed, betraying their intrinsic disharmony in the vain effort to unite them." Strauss cannot understand that we have Divine within us, which is our soul, and that we also have human. We know only too well that human and Divine are discordant; they war one against the other.

Strauss says: "The watchword of modern times is to regard everything as alien or irrelevant which is not natural and human." Who is to decide what natural and human truly mean? Does natural mean the nature of beasts? Does human mean the sentiments of the heart? Strauss also says that the life of Christ should be related in these modern times in the same manner as that of other illustrious men. We say that in all history there is no man whose life can in any way be compared with the life of Jesus, which was the only spiritual life ever lived on this earth. Strauss should name these illustrious men whom he has found in history; otherwise, according to his theory, we cannot believe him.

Strauss begins by caviling at the star. Are we not finding new stars even now? Why stumble at the account of the star? Strauss says that Satan tempted Jesus to see if he were really the Son of God, and that Satan must have known before this that he was or was not the Son of God. We say that Satan, being sin, could not know that Jesus was the Son of God

until after the temptation, which, almost word for word, proves that the temptation was for no other reason than to find out if Jesus was the Son of God, for the temptations were all of the kind to which mankind yields.

Strauss gives us some extracts, of what he calls various forms of the attempt to write a life of Jesus. He begins with Hess. Then we find this quotation from Herder: "Must the laws of nature have been arrested in order to convince us now of the intrinsic truth, beauty and necessity of Christ's moral kingdom? Let us rather thank God that this kingdom exists, and instead of brooding over miracles, try to comprehend its true nature; its nature itself must be its evidence to our minds, else all the miracles and prophecies ever wrought or accomplished are for us unsaid, unwrought, unprofitable." We add, this is good. Herder also says: "Why did not the revived Jesus show himself to his enemies as well as to his friends? Namely, that he did not wish to be seized, bound, ill-treated and crucified a second time." Strauss says this shows a conception of the resurrection very different

from that of the church and of the Gospels. We say that the time had not come for Jesus to show himself to his enemies; it is still to come.

From Paulus Strauss gives us this: "The accounts deemed miraculous are really not so when candidly considered; the marvel is not really in the text, but is only an interpolation of the interpreter, that Jesus did not walk on the sea, but on a bank above the water level." We say that if a sinful man knows how to *tread water*, that Jesus, who knew all things, knew how to walk upon the water. Then further, "So in the story of feeding the five thousand, the Evangelists say nothing of how it was done." We say that this was because they did not know how it was done; but it was done, as Jesus himself refers to feeding the five thousand with a few loaves, when he reproves the want of faith in his disciples. "The Evangelists say nothing of the astonishment which would be excited by so wonderful a multiplication of the food." This is the value of the accounts given of Jesus by his disciples; they give the facts, without comment. We can now study the facts with our present

knowledge, which we could not have done had the disciples given their interpretation; those to come after us, generation by generation, will be able to do the same with the light of their knowledge.

"When we read that an angel by the name of Gabriel visited Mary to announce to her the maternity of the Messiah, we are easily induced to reject the whole story as fabulous." Angels are spoken of very often in the Bible, and they exist whether they appear to us or no.

"If miracles are incompatible with history, then the Gospels are not really historical records." Nor are they, for what relates to the soul cannot be historical. Then speaking of Schleiermacher, Strauss says that he saw, quite as clearly and decidedly as either Herder or Paulus, the impossibility of miracles, and the undeviating constancy of the laws of nature. We say that the laws of nature are not yet fully understood, nor are they constant; if they are constant why are children born deformed? Strauss says that deformities are freaks of nature, yet he is just now telling us that nature

can have no freaks. We say that a product of the life of Jesus, satisfying at once the demands of faith and those of science, can be given.

Strauss says that for everyone who concerns himself with the life of Jesus, there is the necessity of coming to a clear understanding about the miracles. We say the so-called miracles of Jesus were no miracles, as he knew the laws by which they worked, and he himself called them signs; they were miracles to those who witnessed them, as they could not understand the laws by which Jesus, in his Divine nature, performed them. On pages 24 and 25 in Strauss' book, we find what is said of the life of Jesus so small, that we think he has gone out of the way to prove his hatred of Jesus, and we ask what has Jesus done that he hates him to this extent? We say that the science of the future will prove that faith and science are one.

Strauss says that Hase calls his manual an essay towards a really scientific life of Jesus, and that he in consequence writes hardly against him. We say that, so far, it seems to us that Strauss writes in anger against all who do not agree

with him, in his hatred of Jesus, and that he takes a vast amount of trouble to try to prove that the Gospels are false. Well, if he prove it, which he has not done, what does he wish to accomplish?

We agree in part with Hase when he says: "The miraculous endowment of Jesus was a clear dominion of the Spirit over nature, originally conferred upon man at his creation, and regaining its original force through the sinless purity of Jesus, to quell sickness and death; so that there is here no interruption of nature's laws, but only a restoration of her pristine harmony and order." We would add to this that it was conferred on man when he received his soul or spirit, not his human body; and that it is we who interrupt the laws of nature, by breaking them, or forcing them, and so destroying them. In so doing we make diseases of all kinds, and sin and sorrow besides. Strauss objects to Hase's using the word *providence.* He says he should use the word *accident.* Now, if everything in the life of Jesus was an accident, which is what Strauss says, Strauss should

explain to us what an accident really is, its cause and its effect. It seems to us that to say a thing is an accident, means that it is a thing done through our own ignorance or neglect; it is never the effect which we mean the cause to have; it is unlooked for in our actions; we cannot explain it before it takes place, or tell what it will be.

In speaking of the death of Jesus, Strauss has forgotten that they pierced the side of Jesus, an act more calculated to kill, than breaking a bone. The death of Jesus was no accident to him; he foretold it long before it took place. He went to Jerusalem to meet it. He knew it would be the effect of his teachings, how it would come about, and when it would take place; he did not avoid it.

And now Strauss writes what he thinks of the life of Jesus. He says, "history is gold." We say that no history is pure gold; it cannot be, for it is written by man, and man is always biased in writing history of any kind.

On page 38, we find Strauss' reason for trying to destroy the universal belief in Jesus, so ex-

treme, that it would seem silly, if it were not vindictive, and we cannot understand it. He says that in the present age, no one can have a belief in a miracle, but we say that he must first tell us what a miracle is. We sincerely believe what we have read of the life of Jesus, written by those who lived when Jesus was on this earth. The Gospels are not a history and they cannot be treated as such; they are biographies; in other words, they are the life of Jesus, written by several persons, as they saw it, and there can be no better proof of the truth of the Gospel account of the life of Jesus, than the effect of that account upon the lives of men. If it turn them from evil to good, the account is a true one, no matter who wrote it, and if we cannot be sure who wrote the Gospels, the proof is the stronger that they are inspired.

However, to us it makes little difference who wrote them, so long as we know that they are an account of the life of Jesus. We all believe that Jesus lived on this earth at the time mentioned in the Gospels, and we believe that the Gospels tell us of his life. There is no foundation for an

attack on Jesus. Strauss cavils at the account of the money found in the fish. We advise him to ask common sailors what things have often been found in hooked fish when opened by them.

Page 45. "True religion may be allowed to date from Jesus, as philosophy may date from Socrates, and science from Aristotle; and since their time important improvements have been made and may yet be made." The only improvement we can make on what Jesus taught, is to try to understand the spiritual meaning and to put it in practice. "It is easy to say, when confronting these miracles with science, that the required proof has not been given." The proof has been given by the inward belief in the signs, that is, in the hearts of thousands of Christians.

"There must be a distinct renunciation of the notion that the ideal and the historical, the natural and the supernatural man unite in one individual, and that one may be real man, yet at the same time elevated above all real humanity."

We say that this is possible; a real man may be elevated above all real humanity, for humanity is only animal, and many a man can over-

come the animal in which he dwells, and which is real humanity. What is it in a real man that enables him to elevate himself above the human, if it is not his soul, which is his double nature? The soul, so powerful in Jesus that the human body which held his soul was ideal, and the power of his soul over the body, in which he dwelt, were supernatural. It is this power over the human, which Jesus has shown us in his life, that we also may gain over our humanity if we follow his example.

Page 47. "How often books appear under fictitious names, and how often anonymous writings are falsely ascribed to particular persons." But why should the disciples write anonymously, if they could write at all? Surely not to escape persecution, for they ran that risk much more in preaching Jesus. "When a writing, bearing a certain name, is transmitted to us from antiquity, its authenticity is assured only when it is alluded to as the work of the presumed author." According to this we cannot doubt that Moses and the Prophets wrote some kind of writings, for Jesus says in one of his parables, "They have

Moses and the Prophets, if they will not believe them, they would not believe if one rose from the dead."

"It is clear that external testimonies to authenticity can seldom be so satisfactory and convincing as not to need support from internal probabilities." How can any history, then, be considered as strictly true? If it cannot, how can one truly judge the Gospels as history alone?

"A clergyman of Hesse discovered some papers at Darmstadt from which it appears that the real writer of the poem, St. Christopher, was a priest, and Frischlin had no more to do with it than to superintend the publication, and to insert here and there a correction." Nevertheless, if he consented to have anything to do in helping the publication, and in correcting it, he did not disapprove of it, but showed his belief in it, and gave it to the world. So did those who wrote the life of Jesus.

Page 52. "And the prevailing party did actually order all those books which offended them to be burned." Yes; but we have seen how the Gospels were saved from the general burning in

"The Old Documents and the New Bible," by J. Paterson Smyth. Much was saved.

"There is a pretended epistolary correspondence of Christ with King Abgarus of Edessa, which Eusebius professes to give from the Syriac original." This might be true, since all in it is true to the Gospel account, except the letter, for Jesus always sent verbal answers to questions.

Page 58. "Matthew noted down in Hebrew language the speeches of the Lord, and everyone interpreted them as well as he could." This is exactly what we should do, and not take the interpretation of others as being infallible.

"Luke distinguishes those who take in hand to set forth the things believed among them from the eye-witnesses." Strauss should tell us who were then the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; this he does not do. "Neither the reference to Christ's exhortation nor the allusion to the clause in the Lord's Prayer can be mistaken in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians when he says, 'Pray the all-seeing God not to lead you into temptation, as the Lord has said,

the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.'" These words alone are proof of our double nature, the spirit or soul fighting to be God's, the flesh too weak even to try to be God's.

Page 70. "Justin says, when Jesus was baptized in the Jordan, the voice from Heaven echoes the words in Ps. 2 : 7. 'Thou art my Son, this day I have begotten thee,' and that the Epistle of Barnabus states that the Evangelists had been the most accursed sinners." We say that Jesus, in Spirit, was the Son of God; the light that descended on him was the Spirit of God, the electric spark, God's agent; and we also say that it may be possible that the Evangelists were sinners, since Jesus came to sinners and not to saints. A cave in the East is often used as a stable, and a fire means a light like fire. In these two things it seems to us that Strauss is trying to strain at a gnat. Why compare Cæsar and St. John? the first was all of this earth, the last was far above it.

Page 82. Why go to the writings of the so-called fathers to understand the Gospels? They

were men full of conceit. We do not want them; we have the Gospels for ourselves, and the promise of Jesus that we will be able to understand his words in the Gospels, by the help he gives us in our souls. We are to go forwards, and not backwards to the writings and understandings of the fathers. All their knowledge was good for their day, but we have inward convictions to help us in our day, and much advanced knowledge. We should use them, and not the inward convictions of their day.

Page 97. We have here an account of the dispute between Christian churches in Asia, and Romish; and we say that here the Roman Church began to *add* so much that was harmful to the Christian belief and religion.

Page 100. The Apostle John may have been of low rank, a Galilean fisherman, and yet have been an acquaintance of the high priest. Strauss, in his book, often asserts a thing without proving to our minds that it is so. He says that John, in old age, could not have been able to identify himself with a novel mode of thought,

We do not agree with this, for many men who live long change, and John, who no doubt passed all his years in thinking of Jesus, must have been able, if not to write himself, at least to dictate the Gospel to some of his disciples.

Has not Strauss in a few years changed somewhat, what he at first wrote of the life of Jesus? Since the apostles could not have understood all the spiritual sense of the words of Jesus, it is only reasonable to believe that whoever wrote the Gospel of St. John had received the promise from Jesus, the promise that he would send enlightenment after his death, which would help them to understand his life and teachings.

Page 102. The Evangelists differed in their writings, because they were different, that is all; the real author being the Holy Spirit, we say the Holy Spirit does not differ; but men, even in spirit, must differ somewhat, inasmuch as their souls as well as their bodies are individual, and that one expresses himself at greater length than another. This is done to-day, why not in the past? Strauss says it is not to be imagined that the Holy Spirit could not have inspired any

of the writers of the Gospels with what was so incorrect. This, we think, is small in Strauss. He adheres entirely to the letter; he forgets that the Spirit is *not* to be taken literally, as we are all too ignorant in our small minds to understand the things of the Spirit literally. Strauss will be astonished hereafter, when he finds out what literally in spiritual things truly means.

Page 105. The Mediator between God and man, is the daysman in Job, whom we call Jesus Christ. We say it may be that Matthew and John stand in contrast to each other in the Gospels, as Jesus came to dwell in the flesh with us, and he was also the Spirit of God. Strauss, in his book, tries hard to do away with the Gospel of St. John, because it has the spiritual teaching of Jesus in it. Strauss would have nothing but the flesh; he will have nothing of the Spirit of Christ. Renan shows in his life of Jesus, that Jesus was all spiritual, and would have nothing to do with the flesh; so we understand Jesus to have been, on this earth.

Page 114. This also is straining at a gnat, for Strauss has been telling us, so far, that the differ-

ences in the Gospels prove that they are not true. Now he tells us that the disciples selected the same number of persons cured by Jesus, with only a few differences, and he cavils at this being so.

Page 116. Even if it should be true, that if the Gospel of St. John had been discovered now, the Jesus in it would be found to be very different from the Jesus in the first three Gospels. We can understand its being so, for Matthew, Mark and Luke were plain men, and they give plain facts. St. John lived long enough to study these facts in the light of many things which he remembered later to have been told to him by Jesus himself; and the Spirit made him see these things in a spiritual light. If John's Gospel was written later than the first three, it is all the more convincing in its spirituality, for John had a long life in which to study these things.

Page 123. Strauss says: "The fourth Gospel puts speeches in the mouth of Jesus, which suppose a knowledge of the philosophy of a later age." If John could write them, or anyone else, for that matter, it was more than possible in

Jesus. We find that Strauss is judging the writing of the Gospels, which were written so long ago, in the same way as he would judge modern writings, and not taking into consideration that they are not history, but an account of the life of a person, such as never lived on this earth before. The apostles had a difficult thing to do, or whoever it was that wrote the Gospels. Our view of this case is just as possible as Strauss' view, as he cannot possibly be sure of what he tells us here, since he himself was not an eye-witness.

Strauss tells us that the accounts of the life of Jesus are unhistorical, and only capable of explanation by taking into consideration the peculiar tendency of the writer, St. John. This is just the reason that we cannot yield to Strauss' arguments against the truth of the Gospels. He cannot accuse us of being prejudiced, for he here gives as a reason himself for not yielding our belief to his own, his peculiar tendency is to destroy the Christian religion, root and branch.

Page 125. Strauss here tells us that *he* decides that not one of the Gospels was written by eye-witnesses, but by men who penned down notices

and speeches and in part inventions of their own, and that his tactics are to overthrow the Gospels, and make it impossible to know what is true and what is false in the evangelical history. We would say to him, why take the trouble to write a life of Jesus, if you confess, as you do here, that your only reason is to combat the critics, whom you mention? Would you destroy the hope of this wicked world, and trample Jesus under your feet, only to overcome men as human in flesh as yourself? Strauss himself tells us, that he not only would, but does do so. He says also that Nicodemus is an unreal person, that the scene with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, is nothing more than a poetic fiction, and the raising of Lazarus impossible. We hold these three most precious, and what they contain must not be lost to the world, no matter what Strauss or the churches think about them.

Page 127. Strauss says: "In *my* critical discussion of the life of Jesus, *I* exposed the contradictions and showed the inadmissibility of all attempts to harmonize them. *I* estimated the amount of their credibility in every individual

point of the evangelical history." After telling us this, he boasts of having destroyed for the world the Gospel of St. John. It is almost the same as boasting of having destroyed so many souls, for how can Strauss tell the effect of his work on timid and weak souls? Does he expect us to say to him "Well done?"

Page 128. "In the case of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda, the thirty-eight years of his sickness are set aside as a groundless assumption on the part of the Evangelist; in the case of Lazarus, a mere appearance of death, and in that of the man born blind, circumstances are assumed which only required a skillful physician in order to be perfectly curable." Now we wish to say that according to this, Lazarus was buried alive and remained alive though buried. Also, that the sick man may have been known to the Evangelist for thirty-eight years, and that Strauss cannot prove that he did not know him. Strauss here admits that Jesus was a skillful physician. We do not read in the Gospels that Jesus studied to be a physician, therefore this proves that the knowledge he had of how to cure the sick

was a knowledge of all the causes of sickness, and a knowledge of the means to cure sickness. Strauss' efforts to give reasons why all this should not be true, are malicious. Strauss continues to disagree with all others who have written a life of Jesus, and says he is surprised that Renan did not open his eyes to the falsehood of the raising of Lazarus. We say here: "When doctors disagree, we are not willing to believe any of them." It makes no difference to us if St. John wrote the Gospel bearing his name or not, the Gospel was written by someone, it speaks of the life of Jesus, and it is written by someone who understood the spiritual meaning in the life of Jesus and in his teachings. If this unknown person gave the Gospel the name of St. John, it was for the same reason that Strauss inscribes his book to the memory of his brother. Though his book does not give us the life of his brother, it is meant to be a life of Jesus. Strauss says that the differences of the Evangelists arise only from inaccuracy, caprice, or accident. All these we say belong to evil, and can only work

evil; we are not willing, therefore, to allow that this can be so.

Page 155. Schwegler says the theological spirit has corrected the Gospels at every step forwards, it has struck out what it did not like, introduced watchwords of its own, till the Gospel reform established the Roman Catholic Church. This we say may be true, as the Roman Catholic Church still adds new beliefs and dogmas to its Church's teachings up to this day. Strauss says that Matthew wished to play the learned man and display his knowledge when he wrote of the birth of Jesus and of the taxing of Quirinus. We think this very small of Strauss, and that he clearly judges this according to what he would do himself. It is true that the Evangelists were human, but they were sincere in what they wrote or told of Jesus, and we cannot believe that they wished to play the parts of learned men. We cannot see with Strauss that the Gospels are false because they do not agree to the letter with each other. That each gives an account which the others have not, is only a proof that they are not written by one person.

Page 171. Strauss is here again very small. He cavils because the word sandals is put for shoes, and because Jesus in the temptation was in the desert with the *wild beasts*. As we are descended from the beasts, it may be just possible that the evil spirits of mankind are sent back to dwell in them, until the wild beast in man is used up by its natural life. This mention of the wild beasts in the temptation of Jesus may mean more than we think it does. These chapters in Strauss' book prove that we cannot do without all four Gospels, in order to understand the life of Jesus.

On page 195 Strauss gives us his Credo. We would ask him if Jesus said or did not say, blessed are those who believe the things they have not seen. Strauss has not seen God, does he believe in God or not? Strauss says: "Sometimes God himself on his behalf (Jesus') breaks through the chain of natural events and causes a supernatural state of things." We ask of Strauss to explain to us a cyclone or an earthquake, for they break through the chain of natural events. Again he says that the Christian

faith calls upon science to allow miracles to exist within the Christian circle. We say no, she does not; but she calls upon science to prove the miracles by scientific explanations, which she believes true science can do, and which it is too weak yet to have done. Science is not true to itself unless it seeks for the truth without prejudice, for it is a gift from God.

Strauss says that God cannot do anything against the laws of nature. How about our free wills? We are nature. Is it nature to kill, to steal, to defraud and to plot evil? Are all these things of God? If we can do anything against this evil nature, why cannot God also? God is separate from this world. Strauss thinks not; hence Strauss' impotency to understand God in Christ. We are, as science says, descendants of animals, and through them, we say we are the descendants of Satan. We were then not made in the flesh by God, for God cannot make evil, and we are evil. Who can say that we are not evil? God, then, only appears on the side of the world in a series of individual, successive,

Divine operations. We are truly imperfect; who can say that we are perfect?

Strauss says on page 198, "Every miraculous interference of God with the course of nature would be a correction of the creation, consequently, a proof of its imperfection." This he says in reference to the miracles of Jesus. Now, the miracles of Jesus were mostly cures of the sick, blind and lame. These three things are not nature in perfection; they are imperfections, and Jesus in his cures made them perfect according to nature; this was not interference in her natural course; it was a proof of her imperfection, as Strauss says. If he mean human nature, he is doubly right, for as we are the descendants of animals, we are imperfect.

Page 200. Strauss says: "There are no instances of events demonstrably contradicting the laws of nature." We are astonished that Strauss should make this statement, for he forgets that we do not know all the laws of nature yet, and he cannot state affirmatively that what cannot be explained is outside the laws of nature.

Strauss, under the heading of Myth, says that the stories of the star, of the transfiguration and of miraculous feeding, are all fictions. Now, we say that these events are not given to us in the Gospels as natural events, but just the opposite.

Unnatural things do happen frequently, and if Strauss has no imagination, in other words, no inward thoughts and inward convictions, this is no reason why others cannot imagine these things to have taken place.

Page 202. Does Strauss believe in the Bible Messiah? If so, will he tell us something about the Messiah? Does Strauss believe in the miracles of Moses? If so, why does he disbelieve in the miracles of Jesus?

Page 205. Strauss here speaks of the Messiah, as understood in the Old Testament, and he does not understand that all these things were to take a spiritual form from Jesus. The second Adam can only mean the life of the soul, and its victory over the life in the body. Strauss asks why the miracles of Moses and Elias, of which so many were of vengeance, were not imitated by Christ. He says it was because Christ was

of a different spirit from Moses and Elias. Strauss wishes to prove that Christ was not a prophet like unto Moses. We answer Strauss by saying, Moses and Elias were flesh alone; Christ was the first human being who was all spiritual.

Page 206. "It is not a covering in which a clever man clothes an idea which arises in him for the use and benefit of the ignorant multitude, but it is only simultaneously with the narrative, nay, in the very form of the narrative which he tells, that he becomes conscious of the idea which he is not yet able to apprehend purely as such."

This we understand as a proof that those who wrote the Gospels, so as to benefit the ignorant, were guided by the Spirit, for they were honestly seeking spiritual things through their own spirit or soul, trying to write spiritual things which they understood; trying to write them as plainly as they could. Their case was no different from other cases, no different from science or music, or anything where the idea is gained by study and long and constant thought, honestly, sincerely pursued. The usual result of such

earnest thought is that one becomes conscious of *not the idea*, but of *the truth of the idea*. So must the Gospel of St. John have been written. The truth of the Divine Spirit which dwelt in Jesus, hence the spiritual in that Gospel!

Page 208. Here Strauss gives us the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well. We have written our answer in our Essay on "The Origin of Sin." It would be the same here. The miracle at Cana, the Samaritan woman, the feeding the many with few loaves—these are the stumbling blocks to Strauss; he cannot explain them, and yet they are recorded.

Page 216. Strauss here says that he has gained a victory over the Gospel account of the life of Jesus; but we do not think that he has proved his victory, for his saying that he has gained it, does not make it so. Is Strauss infallible? He certainly thinks himself so, but that is no reason that we should think him infallible.

Page 218. We think that we should here call upon Strauss to give us his true reasons for his vindictive hatred of Jesus, and of those who try to teach others to know, and love, and follow

Jesus. We hope and pray that we will not be living on this earth when all belief in God, whom we can only know through Jesus, has utterly died away. We can wish Strauss nothing worse than to hope he may live to see the result of his own work. We doubt that his work will succeed, as he wishes it to do, for most of us have souls, and our souls teach us much that Strauss does not know even the semblance of.

This ends his Introduction.

On page 221 Strauss says that Christians call science, infidel. We say that it is not, and cannot be infidel, as true science is of God, and seeks the truth.

Strauss here speaks of the Society of the Essenes, who had deep religious and moral powers. They seem to have understood that they must overcome flesh and blood, if their souls were to live. They were dissatisfied with the traditional public exercises of religion by their people; they kept themselves at a distance from the polluting intercourse of men in general. The object of their union was to release the soul

from the bonds of the body. We are called on to do the same if we are Christians.

Philo says of the Essenes, that they worship God not by sacrificing beasts, but by endeavoring to make their state of mind an acceptable offering to God. This, we say, is just what we think we should do as Christians.

Page 240. Genuine piety and morality are bound to preserve their power by entering into the world and penetrating and sanctifying their relations with that world by their own spirit. We say this is exactly what Jesus did.

Page 245. Strauss says: "Plato does not, as Socrates did, consider virtue as the only true means of attaining happiness, but makes happiness to consist in virtue as the right condition, harmony and health of the soul, and in so doing he makes virtue, in so far as it has its reward in itself, independent of all impure motives, even of a regard to future recompense, which, nevertheless, he emphatically inculcates. Thus he raised the idea of virtue as much above the Christian idea of it, as the point of view of the genuine philosopher is as compared with the ordinary

religious point of view, and only the foremost of the Christian teachers have, in this respect, come near to Plato."

We would answer this by saying that we read, in the Gospels, "When you have done your duty you are still an unprofitable servant to God; and also that those who claim rewards for their virtuous works hereafter, if they are not in heart and soul pure and virtuous in the sight of God, to them Christ will say, 'Depart, I never knew you,' though they have even cast out devils in the name of Christ." How strange that Strauss does not see this in the Gospel, but then he does not believe that the Gospels are true, and he hates Christ. He does not hate Plato; he believes that the writings which bear the name of Plato are true and written by Plato himself. Certainly virtue is the true life of the soul, but we do not let the soul live its true life within our bodies. The soul does not live its true life for the sake of reward, for virtue is its nature. If you kill virtue in the soul, you kill the soul, as its life is virtue, the same as the blood is the life of the body. If you shed the

blood of the body you kill the body. The reward of preserving the blood in the body is the life of the body. The health of the body is the happiness of the body; the health of the soul is the happiness of the soul. It is not an impure motive to preserve the life of your body; it is not an impure motive to preserve the life of your soul, as Strauss would here have us believe that it is. We say that future recompense, if called at all by that name, is the natural result of allowing our souls to grow fit to be the survival of the fittest hereafter, that is, after the death of the body of flesh and blood. If Strauss thinks that Plato is so far above the Christian idea of virtue, it is because he has only taken the view of the Roman Catholic Church, where rewards are the only inducements held out to persuade the ignorant to obey the dogmas of their Church.

Page 256. Strauss here says that John the Baptist sent his disciples to Jesus, with questions which show that John had doubts of the Messiahship of Jesus. Yes, it is true that John did this, but we read on, expecting Strauss to

refer to the rest, that John, seeing Jesus pass by, said, "Behold the Lamb of God." St. John 1: 29, 36. "And John bare *record*, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him, and I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost, and I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." St. John 1: 32, 33, 34.

Strauss passes these records over in a way which does not do him much credit, and which is decidedly mean and bitter in him. Why give but one example of a thing, and not all that is in the record? The sending of the disciples to Jesus by John the Baptist, who was in prison, and could not be a witness himself to the signs of Jesus, was the only means by which he could convince the disciples themselves—that is, John's disciples.

Page 264. Strauss speaks of Jesus who, in his answer to the rich young man who addressed him with the words, "Good Master," repudiated

this epithet as one belonging to God alone. We say yes, because the young man addressed Jesus as though he were human. The Divine nature in Jesus he did not see or know; besides, Jesus asked this man a question, which he did not answer because he could not. The question was, "Why call me good?" The answer to this should have been, "Because you are the Son of God, through the Spirit of God which dwells within you." But not perceiving this in Jesus he could not answer; he was incapable, through trusting all to his riches, of perceiving the Divine in Jesus, not on account of them, since, though rich, Jesus saw much that was right in this young man, but because of his great trust in them.

Page 266. Strauss here speaks of baptism, which did not take place in the most ancient church until after the death of Jesus, but was considered an institution of Jesus himself. We say, nevertheless Jesus was baptized by John, and we read that the disciples of Jesus baptized; but Strauss rejects so much from the Gospels as

not being true, that he has a very small record of these matters to which he can refer.

Page 267. Strauss here speaks of many things which refer to Jesus. It seems strange to us that he should speak of them at all. After telling us that they are not true, he should drop them and not speak of them again.

Page 268. Strauss here says that if Jesus had told his disciples before that he was the Messiah, he could not have asked them who they thought he was. We think this small, for Jesus first asks, "Whom do men say that I am?" and when they answer, "John the Baptist, and some say Elias, and others one of the Prophets," then Jesus asks, "But whom say ye that I am?" a most natural question to ask his disciples in order to know if they thought as any of these men.

Page 269. Strauss here infers that Jesus may have thought that he was to make of the people of Israel an imperial nation. We would say to Strauss, no, you are decidedly wrong here, for Jesus repeatedly said his kingdom was not of this earth. In his temptation the kingdoms of this earth were refused by him, and nothing in

the account of his life shows that he wished an imperial nation. Strauss has here been using the Gospel account of the life of Jesus, and to that account we will strictly keep him.

Page 271. Strauss says that Schleiermacher says in his "Lectures upon the Life of Jesus," "The moment that we allow the consciousness of a pre-existence in Jesus to be considered an actual recollection, the really human consciousness in him ceases." We say no, for Jesus had a double nature; he had a human consciousness and a Divine consciousness in his soul. We have the same, but in a very small degree compared to Jesus. How can we know spiritual things if this is not so? We know them by the consciousness of our souls. We would ask Strauss if he thinks that there is no such thing as a soul.

Strauss says, "It is inconceivable to us, because in accredited history no instance of it has occurred." No, it has not, but that to us seems no reason that it should not be. History is written by fallible man, and man does not know all the works of God. "And if anyone should speak of having such a recollection we should

consider him a fool, or, if not, an impostor." Of course, but Jesus was not *anyone;* and there are a great many things related to the knowledge of the soul, which a person like Strauss, who does not believe in a soul, would never know. "A God become human should let his Divinity shine forth." We do not consider Jesus a God become human, as there is but one God, and no man can see God and live. Man did not die when he saw Jesus; he was a human man, with the Spirit of God within, which made him the Son of God.

Strauss cavils because we call Jesus the light of the world, and because Jesus said that who had seen him had seen the Father, that is, God. Strauss misunderstands this. We understand that Jesus said he was the light of the world; that is, he gave us the true knowledge of God, for knowledge is light, and in seeing the earthly life of Jesus, the goodness in him, we saw what the nature or goodness of God truly is. "Everyone finds the well-known expression, *l'état c'est moi*, revolting, because it claims for one man exclusively what belongs to all." Jesus had

nothing to do with state or nation, and cannot be compared with those who did. No one can study the Gospels without seeing that this is so. Strauss says that he is offended because St. John states that Jesus said, "I and my Father are one." It is an expression very often used, meaning one in feeling, one in idea, one in purpose, one in understanding, one in any work to be done. Strauss says, "It is incomprehensible to me." That is just it; he cannot understand the spiritual in Jesus. Strauss says no man could have said, "Who sees me, sees my Father;" nevertheless, this expression has been used even in speaking of human bodies in their flesh likeness to each other, and Jesus was more than mere man, and he was speaking of his spiritual life on this earth. Strauss misunderstands Jesus when he says that Jesus was a subordinate God who had become man. This is making more than one God, and that God is called the Father of men. Their Father in heaven means the Father of their souls, and not of their bodies of clay. We consider that Satan is the father of their human bodies.

Page 275. This refers to Jesus saying that no one can know the Father but those to whom the Son will reveal him. We understand this to be, that those who believe in Jesus will be able to see in him that the Spirit of God dwells in him; reveals means to discover, to show, to lay open. Again Strauss refers to the words "without it, was made nothing that was made." These refer to the creation of the world. God spake the words, "Let there be light," and so in Jesus was the Word of God, for God spoke to us through Jesus, and the Word was God, just as a word spoken by a person is understood to be the person.

Again Strauss says, it was not until after the resurrection of Jesus that all power was given to him in heaven and earth. We understand this, as Jesus dwelt here in flesh, the same as ours, and the flesh could not have all power in heaven, if equal on earth. The flesh in which Jesus dwelt saw death before the power was given.

Again Strauss says, "If no one but the Father knows the Son, was Jesus so mysterious a Being

as only to be capable of being known by God?" We answer yes, in the Spirit, for the Spirit of God was in Jesus, and man could not know it, only God, who is Spirit, could know it.

Page 277. Strauss here says, "The Sermon on the Mount has always been, and rightly so, regarded as the nucleus of the synoptic speeches of Christ. Keim calls it 'the most genuine of all that is genuine.' Even in the introduction to it, the new Christian view of the world drops down like a fertilizing rain in spring, compared with the ancient world; it is a world inverted, and instead of starting from the external, and that it agrees with the internal, Jesus considered the internal (soul) exclusively the essential, which outweighs an opposing external." We say that this in itself and alone, proclaims Jesus, its author, as different in Spirit from the rest of mankind. It was certainly not the element surrounding the young days of Jesus. He was not taught these things by others. How, then, came he to know them, if not by the Spirit of God which was in him?

Page 279. "The Sermon concludes at last with the saying, 'That ye may be the children

of your Father which is in Heaven: for he maketh the sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' If there is a speech in the New Testament that came from the lips of Jesus, this certainly did so." Strauss says *if;* we say, "Who, then, spoke this speech?" He tells us of the quarrels and fanaticism among men, making it impossible, according to this, that anyone but Jesus spoke the words.

Strauss is generous enough to say here that the fundamental intuition of God could not have come to Jesus from the Old Testament, for its Jehovah was a wrathful, jealous God, recompensing and punishing strictly, and the Jews represented Jehovah, at all events to the heathen, only as a punishing and avenging God. There was an obstacle to any milder view of his character, and the view of God as a Father is foreign to the Old Testament. Jesus made it the fundamental view of the relation of God to man, but his doing so can only have been the suggestion of his own mind. At last, Strauss is forced by his study of the Gospel to allow this much!

We repeat, from where, then, did Jesus get this view of God, if not through the true Spirit of God within him? Before this man's view of God was taken from what he was himself, and he was ignorant in not understanding that all the suffering, sorrow, and troubles were caused by himself, and not sent to him by God. The history of the world proves that this is so. Famine, pestilence, wars, and other evils, can all be avoided by knowledge put in practice, and have so been avoided. Why, then, say that they are sent by God?

Page 282. Strauss says that there is nowhere in the accounts of the life of Jesus any intimation of any severe mental struggles, to assist in the formation of his mind. Such being the case, the Spirit of God must have been in Jesus. Strauss says that Jesus must have had periods of cheerful unity with himself, and then gloomy struggles, and numerous deviations from the right way. We think this is impossible, and even though Jesus was acquainted with grief, we cannot imagine it. Strauss says that Jesus may have had a struggle in the temptation,

We should think that Strauss would accept this view of the temptation, as it supports his view that Jesus was only man. In denying this view of the temptation he permits our view of it, that Jesus, through the Spirit of God, overcame the temptation.

Then Strauss says that the inward development of Jesus proceeded, if not without strong effort, still without any violent crisis. He says this, and yet he doubts that Jesus was different from other men. He also says that the religious genius in man would carry on his work in an independent spirit. What is genius, but an essence from God, and the independent spirit was certainly strong in Jesus.

Page 284. "On one hand we have Jewish sin-offerings, and that God would not forgive sins without these sacrifices; on the other hand we see Jesus, where he observed upright repentance, faith, and love, at once granting forgiveness of sins, out of the fullness of his own religious consciousness." This is allowing much on Strauss' part, and we do not suppose he would allow this much if he did not believe this account

of Jesus to be true. We ourselves do not think that the death of Jesus was a sin-offering, as Strauss understands it. We get this idea of sin-offering from St. Paul. We think that Christ died for us, as he lived on the earth for us, and suffered persecutions for us. To consent to live on this earth in order to teach mankind the way to re-enter Heaven in their souls, when they did not believe that they had souls, was at once a sacrifice of his (Jesus') life in the flesh. These men he tried to teach were the descendants of Satan through animals. They only knew the animal life, and they believed it was the only life, being Satan's children in the flesh. They, like Satan, were not going to believe in the true life of the soul. They were not taught through the flesh that there was such a thing as the soul. This spark from God was just alive in them, and that was all. It had not grown to consciousness, and that was the task which Jesus, sent by God, was to work out for us. It was natural to flesh and blood bodies, descended from Satan in animal shape—whether we call them mankind or any other name—to oppose Jesus, even to death

—death being created by Satan, and the life of the soul being death to Satan.

As the Spirit of God dwelt in the body of flesh and blood, belonging to this earth, in the person we call Christ, Satan exerted his powers against that person. The agents he used were men in the flesh, which he, Satan, created. The powers of Satan are sufferings in the flesh and death in the flesh, therefore Jesus foretold his own death, knowing that the body of flesh could not escape from it. He had accomplished his work, which was wholly spiritual; he had shown us that the Spirit can control the body it dwells in, that the soul can begin its eternal life here on earth, by knowing God inwardly as Christ has shown God to be. He had told us that it was the only way the soul can return to God to whom it belongs, and by whom it was created, and that it is the soul which is the image of God, who is its Father, and not the body of flesh, who is the child of Satan. We think it impossible that Christ could have been a sin-offering, for sin is of Satan; and Christ was not an offering to save Satan, or for the sins of Satan, or for the

sins of Satan's descendants. Christ died in the body as the natural ending of the body of flesh; and the natural result of the cruelty of the descendants of Satan.

Page 287. Strauss says that Jesus was not aware of the drift of his own words, when he says, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man." We say it is impossible that Jesus did not know the drift of his own words. Jesus taught higher things than the small outward things of the Jews; he alone taught mankind that the soul is above the flesh, and of more value to us, and the only part of us that dies not. What we eat in the flesh does not feed the soul, and this is the reason that Jesus said, "Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." God's words are, "The bread for the soul."

Strauss, in speaking of the law and the prophecies which Jesus had come to fulfill, does not understand that the law is the ten commandments, and the prophecies are what were prophesied of Jesus. Strauss says that Jesus did

not take part in the Jewish sacrifices for purification and sin. This, we say, Jesus could not do and be true to himself, for he was pure from sin, but we read in the Gospels that Jesus and his disciples kept the feasts of the Jews.

Strauss does not understand, because he is devoid of imagination, that Jesus was able to destroy the Temple of God and that he was able to build it up again within three days; that Jesus, in the human body, was the Temple of God, as the Spirit of God was in him, and Jesus, after mankind had destroyed this Temple by killing him, did raise it up within three days.

Page 295. Strauss says: "None of the Apostles even, according to our present accounts, had attained to the full understanding of the mind of Jesus; this they show by abandoning the dangerous position which their Master had occupied." We agree here with Strauss, therefore it is for us, with the light of our days, to try to understand the mind of Jesus.

Page 307. Strauss says: "Jesus, a mortal man, charged by God with commissions so exalted, to forgive sins, to be Lord of the Sabbath, to be the

Sower of the good seed." Yes, we understand Jesus to have been a mortal man, for as such he died, but we also believe him in spirit to be the Son of God; as we have before said, we believe in his double nature.

Strauss refers to the Book of Daniel where, after the fall of the four beasts, one like the Son of Man comes before the throne of God, and is invested with everlasting dominion over all people. Now, let us see what Daniel tells us of the four beasts, since science tells us that we are the descendants of beasts, or animals, which is the same thing. The first beast was like a *lion*, and had *eagle's* wings; it (the beast) was lifted up, and made to stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it. This seems as if science has spoken the truth. Then the second beast like a *bear* was told to devour much flesh. Then the third beast was like a *leopard*, with the four wings of a *fowl*, and four heads. Then the fourth beast, dreadful and terrible; it had iron teeth, it had feet, it had horns, it was diverse (different) from all the beasts that were before it; it had the eyes of a man, and a speaking *mouth*.

These animals were all half-man half-animal. Perhaps this means that they were generations of men descended from the animals spoken of, with the characteristics or instincts of these animals. These descendants of Satan, the last with the speaking mouth, were more beast than men, doing more evil than the others. And one like the Son of Man can only mean Jesus; he took the form of man, and having died for us in the flesh, we are his, and he is invested with everlasting dominion over all people.

Page 319. Strauss says: "The more Jesus met among his own people with want of sympathy and with resistance, the more he saw the hatred of the upper ranks excited against him, the more occasion had he to adopt the conception of the Messiah, to prepare not only himself, but his followers, to submit to the utmost to oppression, condemnation and execution." We say so must all suffer who follow Jesus. We think that there is no truer proof that we in the flesh are descended from Satan, than the cruel treatment which mankind gives to those who strive to do them good, by teaching them to know real good

and to give up evil things. The benefit to those who are so taught is very great, yet it has always been rewarded by mankind with cruelty and death, even by those whom we cannot call heathens. The heathens themselves give the strongest proof that they resist this good, because they in the flesh are also the children of Satan and animals, untamed and wild.

Page 320. Strauss says: "There is also every probability in favor of the fact that the first revelation of the manner of the death of Jesus, which he made to his disciples, was most displeasing and repulsive to them." Strauss here allows that Jesus did foretell his death and the manner of it, but that he did not foretell his resurrection. Because these things are not, to Strauss' mind, historical, he says he does not believe them. History, we think, is a very uncertain thing, and not infallible, as Strauss thinks it is.

Page 322. Strauss says that, for him, Jesus has either no existence at all, or existed only as a human being. We say that this is a passage in Strauss' book which might have been put into

other words, and which makes us disinclined to believe everything which he has written of the life of Jesus, as it shows hatred of Jesus, and malice because Christians believe in him.

Page 324. "Jesus said that there were some among those standing round him who should not taste death until they had seen the Son of Man coming into his kingdom." Strauss does not understand that this means that the belief of Jesus in the hearts of his followers, in the inward life in spirit, which was to change the outward life of the believers, would come before they all died. This did come true; Jesus always said that the Kingdom of God is within us. Strauss is too carnal to understand the spiritual meaning of the words of Jesus. He says, in speaking of the coming of Jesus, when some go to everlasting fire, and some to everlasting life, that this cannot be taken symbolically, and as the Christian church understands it literally, so it was meant by Jesus, if it was given by him. This is a mistake on Strauss' part; if the church does so believe, it can only be the Roman Catholic

Church. If there be any everlasting fire it is we who make it for ourselves, and not God.

Strauss cavils because Jesus taught his followers to pray "thy kingdom come." He says this shows that the kingdom had not yet come. We say, nor has it yet come, as so many are evil still within their hearts. Strauss also cavils because Jesus said to his disciples, "that he would not drink again of the fruit of the vine, until he drinks it new in the Kingdom of his Father." Strauss forgets that Jesus said he was the vine; the disciples are the branches; and the fruit is the fruit of the teachings of Jesus, that is, the result of his words in our hearts. Jesus would not speak these words again to them until he spoke them in the Kingdom of his Father. The Kingdom of Heaven being already among them when he drives out evil from them by the Spirit of God, means that the Spirit of God cannot be within us, unless it gives us the Kingdom in our hearts.

Page 332. According to the last part of this chapter Strauss believes in a judgment yet to come; and that the good seed sown, and also

the tares, will have their reward. Good seed means good words spoken or written on God's side. Tares are evil words spoken or written on Satan's side.

Page 357. Strauss here tells us that he believes Jesus to have been only human. We, then, can only expect that Strauss will read the life of Jesus in that light. What is more than human he will not, and so cannot, see. When Strauss says that not one of the speeches of Jesus, written by St. John, could be rightly understood so long as Jesus stood as a human being before human beings, he concludes that they were not uttered by Jesus. Strauss seems here to have come upon what he will not see, so he presumes to tell us that, because he cannot see that Jesus, besides being human, was of a higher nature, he did not utter these speeches.

Page 369. Strauss says: "It is an obvious question if Jesus, in the cures he made, did not avail himself of natural remedies. We ask, "How do you know that he did not? Do we, in these days, know *all* the natural remedies for all diseases?" We believe that Jesus knew them all,

and if the gross ignorance and the dark superstitions of the people of those times made them believe that cures effected by natural means were miracles, this is just what the next century will say of us; therefore, we of this century cannot understand the laws by which Jesus made his cures.

Page 391. Here at last Strauss is forced by his study of the life of Jesus, to allow, historically, that Jesus, in his last earthly moments, when a violent and unjust death was near at hand, and the terror of that idea threw dark shadows over his soul, by his moral force maintained his tranquil and Heaven-inspired presence of mind. Yet Strauss, having no life in his own soul, cannot understand the double nature of Jesus.

Strauss says that when Jesus was asked if he asserted himself to be the Messiah, he answered in the affirmative. We read in Matthew Jesus' answer to "Art thou King of the Jews?" His answer was, "Thou sayest." In Mark we read, Jesus was asked, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" This is not, "Art thou the

Messiah," and to "Art thou the Christ?" Jesus answered, "I am." Again in St. Luke we read, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" and Jesus answered, "*Thou* sayest it." In St. John we read that Jesus was asked, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" and Jesus answered, "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?" Being asked a second time, "Art thou a king then?" Jesus answered, "*Thou* sayest that I am a king." We do not read as Strauss reads. The affirmative which he finds in the answers of Jesus as to whether he is the Messiah we do not find in the Gospels. The only affirmative we find is that Jesus says, "I am the Christ."

Page 395. Strauss, in speaking of the death of Jesus, says that a stab with a spear does not kill a crucified person, and quotes the Gospel of St. John, which he has told us all through his book that he does not believe in, to prove that only the hands of Jesus were nailed to the cross. Though he accepts the Gospel of Matthew, he says that the notice there of the watch put at the grave of Jesus will not stand investigation, and that he, Strauss, pronounces all these sayings of

his in an unprejudiced spirit. This we assert is not true, as we have read his book and find in it a hatred of the Christian religion and an effort to kill the belief in Jesus. He tells us of other writers of the life of Jesus, such as Hase and Ewald. We would say that many start out to write a critical life of Jesus, unbelievers in the life and death of Jesus, and in reading their books, we should not forget that this is so.

Page 402. "The Apostle Paul says nothing of the appearances of Jesus before women, who, in the Evangelists, Luke excepted, stand in the foreground." Matt. 28 : 9; Mark 16 : 9; John 20 : 14. We say this is for a very good reason; Paul was an enemy of women, and jealous of them.

Page 432. We answer what Strauss here states of the resurrection of Jesus by saying that what he has written is against himself. We think that there can be no doubt that the Jews would have brought forward the dead body of Jesus to prove that he was dead, had it been possible to find his dead body, which had arisen. Imagination, we say, is the life of the soul; it is

the thinking of the soul. If one have no imagination, how can one believe in the things which one does not see? Even leaving Jesus out of the question, there is much that one must take on faith alone. History tells us things which we cannot see; science tells us things which we do not see; our friends tell us things which we do not see; with our imagination we see them in our minds; books of all sorts tell us things which we cannot see; but is it not possible for us to see these things with our minds? Can one not imagine the things one is reading or hearing about as passing before one's mind? Well, then, why is it difficult for our imaginative spirits or souls to see Jesus as we read or hear of him as he was when on this earth, and as we believe him to be in Heaven? Above all, our imaginative spirits should understand his spiritual teachings.

We close Strauss' book with a sigh of relief that we have finished this task.

EMILY OLIVER GIBBES.

January 30, 1894.

DATE DUE

FACULTY

MAR 2 8 1995

APR 17 1996

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS2420 .R395 G4
Essays ...
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00051 3285